

THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

FEBRUARY, 1838.

HISTORY OF THE INDEPENDENT CHURCH AT STOKE NEWINGTON, MIDDLESEX.

(To the Editor.)

MY DEAR SIR,—I beg to thank you in my own name, and in that of my friends, for your intention to insert an engraving of Abney Chapel, in your increasingly valuable periodical. I hand you herewith an outline of the history of the ancient Independent church in this village, which, if you please, may accompany it. I wish I could have rendered it more perfect. With every sentiment of christian esteem, I remain, your's very truly,

JOHN JEFFERSON.

Stoke Newington, Jan. 3, 1838.

To trace the history of the early Congregational churches, is confessedly a difficult task. In very few instances did the founders of these societies preserve any record of their origin and early history, and their immediate successors have seldom committed to writing the points of information which they obtained from their fathers; and even when such records were made at the time, they have often been lost through the carelessness of those into whose hands they came. Whether any account of the origin and early progress of Independency in this village was at first compiled, is now altogether uncertain; if it were, it has long been lost. The present church-book commences in the year 1826, with the ministry of the late Dr. Harris, who has prefixed a brief narrative of the previous history. The writer of the present sketch has done what he could to render the outline more perfect, but it is still far from being all that could be wished.

The history of evangelical religion in this village can be traced back to the reign of Charles I. The pious and learned Dr. Thos. Manton, of Wadham College, Oxford, and one of Cromwell's chaplains, was presented to the living about the year 1643, by Col. Alex. Popham, who was then lessee of the manor. In the parish church, he delivered

VOL. II. N.S.—VOL. XXI.

K

London, Published by Jackson & Wallard, St Pauls Church Yard, Feb. 1, 1838.

in weekly lectures his elaborate exposition of the epistle by James, which he dedicated to his patron. In the "Epistle Dedicatory," he speaks of himself, as having here enjoyed "a quiet and successful ministry and service in the word for seven years," and of his patron, as having often repaired "those breaches which at any time were made in his estate by the hand of violence;" from which it appears that he was not exempt from the sufferings so painfully characteristic of the times in which he lived. From the "Epistle to the Reader," prefixed to the second edition of the same work, we gather that his congregation was so divided in opinion, upon the great fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, as to render it necessary, in his judgment at the time, to accommodate his preaching to their infirmities. "If," says he, "the style seem too curt and abrupt, know that I sometimes reserved myself for a sudden inculcation and enlargement; for the great controverſie of justification, I have handled it as largely as the epistle would give leave, and the state of the auditory would bear; had I been aware of some controverſies grown since amongst us, I should have said more." Manton resigned the living in 1656, when he was presented to that of St. Paul, Covent Garden. He was succeeded by the Rev. Daniel Bull, in 1657, who continued till the Act of Uniformity, in 1662, when he was ejected. The following account of him is extracted from Palmer's *Nonconformist's Memorial*, vol. ii. p. 458. It appears that he was chosen to the pastoral office by the people; receiving from the state the confirmation of his appointment. "In the vestry book is the following entry: 'Sept. 27, 1657, at a vestry then holden, Mr. Daniel Bull was chosen most unanimously to succeed *Mr. Manton as pastor. The whole parish signed his call, rich and poor, good and bad.' He received his appointment from Cromwell, Nov. 25 following. He was a good scholar, and a very agreeable preacher, who was for some time fellow-labourer with Mr. John Howe; but fell into some immorality, over which the veil ought to be drawn, as there was satisfactory evidence of his true repentance. It was upon occasion of his fall that Mr. Howe preached and printed his excellent discourse upon 'Charity with reference to other Men's Sins.' Mr. Stancliff [who was ejected from Stanmore Magna, and died at Hoxton, Dec. 12, 1705] wrote the following account of his death in the margin of Dr. Calamy's account of him. 'His last hours, and dying prayers and tears, with the cheerful resignation of his soul to Christ, as offered to the worst and chiefest of sinners, in the gospel, spake him both a penitent sinner and a returning backslider. He gave up the ghost in his closet, craving any place where Christ was, though it was but eternally to lie at his footstool.' In the London Collection of Farewell Sermons, there are two by Mr. Bull, who is there said to be of Newington Green, which must be a mistake for Stoke Newington, where the parish church is. One of these was delivered in the forenoon, on John xiv. 16; the other in the afternoon, on Acts xx. 32. They are plain, serious, practical, and affectionate discourses, containing some things very appropriate to the occasion." Two short extracts from the latter are given by Palmer, as above.

For a period, then, of at least twenty-one years, the great doctrines of the Protestant Reformation had been faithfully preached in the parish church of this village, when the Act of Uniformity took place. The farewell sermons of Mr. Bull are in themselves a proof that his labours, and those of his predecessor, had not been "in vain in the Lord." There remained, without doubt, many who knew and loved the truth, and were zealous for its continuance amongst them. At this period there were also resident here some of the members of Dr. Owen's church. Amongst these was Lord Charles Fleetwood, of whom Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. ch. 4. thus speaks: "When he found he could not keep the army within bounds, who were for new changes, he retired from public business, and spent the remainder of his life privately among his friends at Stoke Newington, where he died soon after the Revolution, being more remarkable for piety and devotion than for courage or deep penetration in politics." He took up his abode here about the year 1654, and died October 4, 1692. (Orme's *Life of Owen*, p. 278). Sir John Hartopp also resided here at this period. He was married to one of Fleetwood's daughters, and was a member of Dr. Owen's church, as was also his lady. Dr. Watts, in the introduction to his funeral sermon for Sir John, says, "This town (Stoke Newington) was the place which they had all honoured with their habitation, and spent the largest part of their lives amongst you."

The exact period at which the dissenting congregation in Church Street was gathered cannot now be determined; if it was not immediately after the ejection of Mr. Bull, it was certainly within a very few years. Little doubt can be entertained that it was Independent or Congregational from the first. The Presbyterian section of the Dissenters had indeed considerable strength in the village; but they appear at an equally early date to have originated the interest on Newington Green, which was doubtless Presbyterian in its character. That Fleetwood, Hartopp, Gould, and their families were in some way identified with the place in Church Street is plain, from the fact that Dr. Watts was *there* called to preach funeral sermons on occasion of bereavements in their circle; they were all of them staunch Independents. With one exception (that of Mr. Hodgkins), all the ministers of the place, from the time of the formation of the Congregational Board, in 1727, have been regular members of that body. Mr. Martin Tomkins, the immediate predecessor of Mr. Eaton, who was pastor in 1727, was associated in study at Utrecht with the celebrated Drs. Daniel Neal and Nathaniel Lardner. On their return to England, in 1703, Lardner joined himself to the Independent church in Miles's Lane, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. Matthew Clarke; and six years afterwards "he preached his first sermon for his friend Mr. Martin Tomkins, at Stoke Newington. The subject of his discourse was, Rom. i. 16. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," &c. (Wilson's *Dissenting Churches*, vol. i. p. 89.) If Tomkins and the church over which he presided had not been of the Independent body, Lardner, then a member of an Independent church (he afterwards became a Presbyterian), would scarcely have commenced his ministry here. It

may also be mentioned in this place, that Mr. Asty, who, in exchange with Mr. Tomkins, preached at Stoke Newington the discourse which led to the disclosure of Arian sentiments on the part of the latter, was an Independent, who had spent "the earlier part of his ministry in the family of the Fleetwoods, at Stoke Newington," and was at this period pastor of the Independent church in Rope-maker's Alley. (Wilson, vol. ii. p. 539.) The only pastor before Mr. Tomkins was Mr. Cawthorn. I have not been able to ascertain what were his views on the subject of church government. I may, however, add, that all the names of eminence (and there are not a few of them) connected with this ancient interest, are those of known Independents, and this from the earliest period.

The first pastor of this church was the Rev. Jos. Cawthorn, of the University of Cambridge, who had been ejected from Stamford, Lincolnshire. "Some time after his ejection he came to London, and preached there occasionally. He at last settled at Stoke Newington, where he for several years continued faithful and successful in his ministerial work, being generally respected and beloved. He and his neighbour, Mr. Jos. Bennet (who was then at Newington Green), were much concerned together in their work, with mutual endearment and respect, and with as entire confidence as could have been between father and son. Mr. Bennet did the last friendly office for him, in a funeral discourse from Psalm xxxvii. 37, on March 9, 1707. He represented his text as exemplified in the deceased, and gave some account of him, particularly of his early piety, which had a constant powerful influence upon him through the whole course of his life; his settlement at Stamford, in very good circumstances; his nonconformity in 1662, in which he had always great peace and satisfaction, as he declared a few days before his decease; his temper, moderation, and candour, which kept him from censuring others, of whom he would not speak, in any case, with harshness or bitterness; his patience under a variety of hardships, in which he firmly depended on divine providence, which continually took care of him, and afforded him seasonable supplies, which he would be ready to own with great thankfulness; the nature of his preaching, which was plain, practical, and methodical, suited to the great ends of the gospel ministry; the manner of his life, which was holy, exemplary, and unblameable; and the manner of his exit, which was such as became one that was neither weary of life, nor afraid of death, but that had a firm and steadfast hope in the mercy of God, through Jesus Christ." (Palmer, vol. ii. p. 433.) His remains were interred in the parochial burial ground, March 8, 1707.

The second pastor was Mr. Martin Tomkins. The date of his settlement is not known; but it could not be long after Mr. Cawthorn's death, since it was in 1709 that Mr., afterwards Dr. Nath. Lardner, preached his first sermon here, as we have already mentioned. He retained the charge until July, 1718, when, in consequence of a sermon preached on the 13th of that month, in which he avowed Arian opinions, he was compelled to resign; so strong was the feeling of his congregation on that well-known heresy. The history

of this affair is thus given by Mr. Walter Wilson, (*Diss. Churches*, vol. ii. p. 539) "A few years after Mr. Asty's settlement in London, he had an unhappy difference with Mr. Martin Tomkins, minister of the Dissenting congregation at Stoke Newington, who was shortly afterwards dismissed from his station, on account of some notions which he entertained with regard to the Trinity and the deity of Christ." "The case was this, Mr. Asty and Mr. Tomkins, having made an exchange for one Lord's-day, (June 29, 1718,) as they had sometimes used to do, Mr. Asty took occasion to warn the people at Newington against the danger of pernicious errors and damnable heresies which were at that time creeping in among the Dissenters in general, and particularly referred to errors about the doctrine of Christ's Deity. Mr. Tomkins, who deviated from the commonly received opinions upon this subject, was roused at what he considered an officious interference and an over-forward zeal. Therefore, on the following Lord's-day, [or on the second Sabbath after] he set himself to undo the impression made by Mr. Asty's discourse, and publicly accused him of spreading an alarm among his people, but at the same time plainly and candidly avowing his own sentiments with regard to the points in dispute. This avowal occasioned some unhappy heats in the church, and issued in his expulsion." He removed to Hackney, "where he attended the ministry of Mr. Barker, who was a zealous Trinitarian." There he wrote on the Doxologies, and entered into a controversy with Dr. Watts on the subject of prayer to the Holy Spirit, and there he probably died.

During the ministry of Mr. Tomkins at Stoke Newington, viz. Nov. 25, 1711, Dr. Watts, who was then resident with Sir Thomas Abney at Theobalds, preached here his sermon entitled "The Conquest over Death," on 1 Cor. xv. 26. It was occasioned by a double bereavement in the family of Sir John Hartopp, with whom, as domestic chaplain and tutor to his children, the Doctor had formerly resided. "The Lady Hartopp, daughter of Charles Fleetwood, Esq. and wife to Sir John Hartopp, of Newington, Baronet, died Nov. 7, 1711. Mrs. Gould, their daughter, and wife to Mr. Gould, now Sir Nath. Gould, of Newington, died six days after, viz. Nov. 15, and left their household behind them oppressed with double sorrow." (Note to Watts's Sermon.)

There is extant a funeral sermon for Mrs. Mary Frazer, wife of Mr. Hugh Frazer, merchant, who died March 18, 1716, which was preached here by the celebrated Mr. Robert Fleming.

Mr. John Shower, many years pastor of the English Presbyterian church, which was at last settled in the Old Jewry, and for a short time co-pastor with Mr. John Howe in Silver-street, well known as the author of "Serious Reflections on Time and Eternity," retired to this village about the end of the year 1713, and died here on the 28th of June, 1715. (Wilson, vol. ii. p. 318.)

The third pastor of this church was Mr. Joseph [Query, John] Eaton. He succeeded Mr. Tomkins in the year 1719. In the same year he appears among the ministers engaged in the Salters' Hall debates, and voted against subscription to articles of faith of

human composition. He died Oct. 3, 1733, aged 35 years, and was buried in Bunhill-fields.

Sir John Hartopp died at Stoke Newington, April 1, 1722, in the 85th year of his age, and on April 15th, Dr. Watts delivered here his discourse on "The Happiness of separate Spirits," from Heb. xii. 23. The occasion might well awaken all his refined susceptibilities, and produce what is perhaps the best of all his discourses. Sir Thomas Abney had died at Theobalds on the 22d of February, in the 83d year of his age. The Doctor had thus been deprived of both his patrons within a few weeks of each other, the church of Christ of two of its brightest ornaments, and the cause of Protestant nonconformity and civil liberty of two of its most enlightened advocates and supporters.

Early in the year 1726, the Rev. Matt. Clark, of Miles's-lane, retired to this village "for the benefit of the air and exercise." Here death seized him on the 24th of March. He was immediately removed to his own house, and died on the morning of the 27th. (Wilson, vol. i. p. 485.)

In the year 1728, and also during the ministry of Mr. Eaton, Mr. Asty preached at Stoke Newington, on occasion of the death of Mrs. Eliz. Fleetwood. The discourse, which was published, is founded on Job ix. 12. and was delivered June 23, 1728. (Wilson, vol. ii. p. 545.)

Dr. Watts removed with Lady Abney to Stoke Newington about the end of the year 1733.

About the same time Mr. John Hill settled with this church, as its fourth pastor. He was a member of the Independent church in Back-street, Hitchin, and had been educated at the Independent Academy in London, under Dr. Ridgley. He continued, however, but a short time, "removing, in 1735, to be co-pastor with the Rev. Robert Bragge, at Lime-street, where he was set apart, May 19, 1735. In the course of the same year he removed to the Three Cranes, as successor to Dr. Ridgley." "With this congregation he closed his ministry and life on the 26th of February, 1745-6, in the 35th year of his age," and was interred in the burial-ground belonging to the Independent meeting at Hitchin. "Mr. Hill was a minister of excellent talents, a faithful labourer in the service of souls, an useful preacher, and a most experienced Christian." "In the prospect of dissolution he had the supports of a divine faith, and was enabled to look forward with confidence and joy." There is a volume of excellent sermons by Mr. Hill, which was published by his executors, from the manuscripts which he had left behind him.

The fifth pastor was Mr. Samuel Snashall. The time of his settlement is unknown; he was here in September, 1737. His ordination took place in the summer of 1738, when Dr. Watts gave the charge. Dr. Gibbon observes, "I well remember that the minister who prayed over Mr. Snashall, before the Doctor gave the charge, made use of this expression, 'Lord, we remember our faults this day.' The Doctor took notice of it as falling from the lips of his reverend brother, and approved and adopted it into his preface to

the charge in the easiest and happiest manner." (Milner's Life of Watts, p. 532.) Mr. Snashall was still pastor in 1749, and in an indenture of lease he is referred to as a party in December, 1750; but whether he continued here until his death, or removed to another congregation, is unknown.

On the 25th of November, 1748, the Rev. Isaac Watts, D.D. died at the house of Lady Abney, having resided in the family for about 36 years, the last fifteen of which had been spent in this village. It does not appear that the Doctor had any other connexion with this ancient church, than is implied in such occasional services as have been mentioned. It is said that he was sometimes found attending divine worship there, but I think this was not frequently the case. He usually rode to Bury Street in the morning of the Sabbath, and his evenings were devoted to the spiritual instruction of Lady Abney's household; it is scarcely probable that he attended a third service in the afternoons.

Mr. Meredith Townsend was the sixth pastor. He had been assistant to Mr. Price, at Bury Street, (the church of which Dr. Watts was pastor,) from 1742 to 1746, and afterwards pastor of a church at Hull. From the latter place he removed to Stoke Newington, in April, 1752. In the year 1789, his age and infirmities requiring assistance, Mr. George Hodgkins was chosen to this office, and Mr. T. shortly afterwards resigned the charge. He died at Bath, December 13, 1801. "Mr. Townsend was highly esteemed (says Dr. Harris in the Church Book) for his preaching and character; and the congregation, during his time, was in a flourishing condition, distinguished especially for the opulence of its members. He published several single sermons on particular occasions. Nothing, however, has fallen in my way from which his doctrinal sentiments could appear. I apprehend that he was one of Mr. Job Orton's stamp. He seems to have been very devotional in his spirit and manner."

About the year 1748 or 1749, the illustrious John Howard became a resident in this village. "The delicate state of his health," says Dr. James Baldwin Brown, in his able 'Memoirs' of the Philanthropist, "induced him to take lodging at Stoke Newington, where he lived a life of leisure, though not of idleness, spending his time in the manner in which a man of fortune, whose religious principles and natural inclination, alike prevented his plunging into any of the fashionable dissipations of the day, may be supposed to spend it. Some considerable portion of his leisure hours he there devoted to the improvement of his mind, and engaged, amongst other pursuits, in the study of some of the less abstruse branches of natural philosophy and of the theory of medicine, of which he acquired sufficient knowledge to be of the most essential service to him in his future travels, upon those errands of mercy, which exposed him in so peculiar a manner to the danger of infection from contagious diseases. From the example of his parents, and the care bestowed upon his own education, he had early imbibed those principles of piety, which never forsook him during the whole course of his

active and most useful life. From principle, from habit, and from education, he was a dissenter; as it respects church discipline, an Independent; in doctrine, a moderate Calvinist. The congregation with which he first associated himself in church fellowship was that of the Independent denomination, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. Micaiah Townsend, now under that of the Rev. Thomas Mitchell, formerly of Leicester. Of this church he was regularly admitted a member, but at what precise period of his life I have not been able to ascertain; the earlier records of the proceedings of the church still flourishing there, if any such were at that time kept, having been either mislaid or destroyed; and notwithstanding his subsequent residence in distant parts of the country, he seems never to have dissolved the connection. Whilst regularly worshipping with the congregation, he set on foot a subscription for the purchase of a house for the residence of the minister, to which he himself generously contributed upwards of fifty pounds.* But his liberality was not confined to those to whom he was bound by the tie of christian fellowship in this religious association. During the period of his life in which he resided at Stoke Newington, he gave away a very considerable portion of his income in deeds of charity to those who appealed to his benevolence, or whom his ever active philanthropy sought out as fit objects of his bounty; remembering, as he did, in the distribution of all his alms, the word of the Lord Jesus, how that he said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'"—(*Memoirs of the Public and Private Life of John Howard, the Philanthropist.* 4to. edit. pp. 13, 14.)

Mr. Howard continued to worship with this christian society until 1756, when, upon the death of his first wife, he removed from Newington, "to the deep regret of many of his friends and neighbours, among the poorer classes of whom he distributed such parts of his furniture and other useful articles as he did not require for his new apartments."

On the resignation of Mr. Townsend, Mr. Hodgkins, his assistant, was chosen as his successor, and ordained pastor. The Rev. Noah Hill, his uncle, gave the charge from Col. i. 27, 28. Mr. Hodgkins was born at Hales-Owen, in the county of Salop, July 14, 1765, and was educated first at the Academical Institution at Carmarthen, and afterwards at Daventry. "He is reported to have been a good scholar. He published several sermons and other works, especially a French Grammar. He kept a boarding-school of some note, but in his ministerial services appears to have been unacceptable; for the congregation gradually declined till, as I have been informed, it was reduced to about 12 or 14 persons. He was avowedly an Arian in opinion, and, I fear wanted the devotional

* It is a leasehold dwelling-house, with a small garden and stable, situate on the east side of Edward's Lane. Mrs. Cooke gave £100, and Mrs. Abney £100, towards the purchase. It was occupied by Mr. Townsend; and then by Mr. Hodgkins until 1793, when, having commenced a boarding-school in the High Street, he left the parsonage. It is held under the same lease as the old meeting, which will shortly expire.—*Church Book.*

habits of his predecessor. He died October, 1814, and was buried at Hackney.

"An attempt," continues Dr. Harris, "then made to introduce Unitarianism was mercifully defeated. Of the few who remained, some left the meeting and attended at other places in the neighbourhood. First, the Misses Corp, and afterwards Mrs. Eade, heard the Rev. Thornhill Kidd, then at Clapton, by whose influence, under the recommendation of Mr. Kidd,* there was introduced to the office of Pastor, Mr. Thomas Mitchell, who is yet living. He was educated at Rotherham College, under the late Dr. Williams, and had been settled at Leicester, whence he retired on account of ill health. After a time, he was sufficiently restored to resume ministerial engagements, and settled here in February, 1816. Under his ministry the congregation revived, but not to the extent of his expectations. He therefore resigned about April, 1819.

On the removal of Mr. Mitchell, some members of the congregation invited Dr. Harris, the resident tutor of Hoxton Academy, to labour in this, as almost a missionary station. Though his engagement with the Committee of that Institution precluded his acceptance of a pastoral charge, it forbade not regular ministerial services on the Lord's-day. With the consent of the Committee, he therefore undertook to preach here twice on the Lord's day for a time, considering the measure only as an experiment, but likely, under the divine blessing, eventually to lead to the introduction of a stated minister. The period of his service was, from time to time, prolonged. Several attempts were made to introduce a suitable pastor, but in vain. At length, the Institution being about to remove to Highbury College, the congregation were earnest to procure the rescinding of that rule which prevented his accepting the office of pastor conjointly with his academical engagements. Negotiations for this purpose failed. At length, in answer to the renewed appeals of the congregation, which Dr. Harris permitted them to make to the Committee of the Institution, he was allowed to relinquish the residency, on condition of retaining his engagement as theological tutor. He accordingly became pastor, and took up his residence at Stoke Newington, at Midsummer, 1826.

At this time a new era may be said to have commenced. It devolved upon Dr. Harris to re-organize the church, which he did with twenty-two members. By the blessing of God upon his labours, a considerable revival of religion was effected; but his usefulness was arrested by death, on the 3d of January, 1830.†

* The Misses Corp were enlightened in the truth under the ministry of the Rev. Thomas Shepherd, now the venerated incumbent of St. James's, Clerkenwell, who was for some years afternoon lecturer at the parish church. Mr. Kidd preached the first sermon after the secession of the Unitarian party.

† This respectable scholar and most excellent minister was a frequent contributor to this Magazine, and the Editor has attempted to obtain materials for a biographical memorial of his lamented friend. But the expectation of a distinct Memoir from the pen of his surviving brother has prevented it. Eight years have already elapsed since his lamented death. If it be not published soon, it will be too late for many of his surviving friends.

The present pastor, (John Jefferson,) took the charge at Christmas, 1830. Since the settlement of Dr. Harris, in 1826, one hundred and thirty members have been added : the present number of resident communicants is about one hundred and ten.

Abney Chapel is the third building which has been prepared for the use of this ancient church. The original meeting-house was very near to the house built for Mr. Gunston, and afterwards occupied by Sir T. Abney, probably on the spot where the stables now stand. The present place of worship was erected about the year 1700. It is built on a piece of the demesne lands belonging to the manor, and is held on lease, a few years of which only remain unexpired. It has long been wholly inadequate to the claims of this increasing neighbourhood. Impressed with this fact, a few gentlemen belonging to the congregation met in the vestry of the chapel, on the 4th of April, 1836, and recorded their sentiments in the form of a series of resolutions. From that time efforts were made to raise a fund for building a new and sufficiently commodious place of worship. Just before the close of that year, the Committee determined on the purchase of a piece of copyhold land, directly opposite to the house where Lady Abney had resided. This they effected ; and having enfranchised the land, they had the happiness to witness the laying of the first stone of Abney Chapel, on Monday, July 3, 1837. This edifice is now nearly completed. It has been erected under the superintendence of Mr. Jas. Fenton, of Chelmsford ; its internal dimensions are 64 feet by 43 feet ; and it is calculated to seat 900 persons : about 200 sittings in the galleries are free. There is a minister's vestry at the back of the building, and a large school-room under the front gallery. The following items of the expense may be interesting to some.

Contract for the chapel	-	-	-	-	-	-	£1650
Front inclosure	-	-	-	-	-	-	160
Internal fittings, gas, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
Burial-ground walls	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
Enfranchisement of land, and law expenses	-	-	-	-	-	-	203
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	£2166

Towards this outlay upwards of £1400 have been obtained. The cost of the whole plot of land, exclusively of enfranchisement, &c. was £1000 ; of this the chapel and burial ground occupy an area of 80 feet in front, by 180 feet in depth ; the remaining 120 feet of frontage are to be disposed of for building, the cost of the centre plot being that alone which will ultimately fall upon the congregation.

Thus, Mr. Editor, I have done what I could to "gather up the fragments that remain." Will you, Sir, and your readers, unite with me in devout thanksgivings to the Head of the Church, for his mercy towards his people in this place, and in fervent prayer for the outpouring of his Holy Spirit, without which every effort must be in vain. "Save now, O Lord, I beseech thee ; O Lord,

I beseech thee, send now prosperity." "Let thy work appear unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children; and let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and establish thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish thou it."

We expect to open the chapel for public worship, in a few weeks.

J. J.

ON THE NEGLECT OF FAMILY WORSHIP AND PRACTICAL RELIGION.

THE following faithful appeal to the consciences of their hearers was published in 1720, as an 8vo. tract of sixteen pages, by the United Ministers in and about London of the Presbyterian and Congregational denominations, under the title of "*A Letter to the Protestant Dissenters, relating to the too great neglect of Family Worship, and decay of Practical Religion amongst us. By the direction of some London Ministers.*" As the address is still but too much needed, we trust it will be read with advantage by many, and at the same time illustrate "the union," which existed between the orthodox Presbyterians and Congregationalists at that period. Our copy is "the second edition, London, printed for Eman. Matthews, at the Bible, in Paternoster Row, MDCCXX. Price 2d. or 1s. 6d. a dozen."—*Editor.*

THE Protestant Dissenting Ministers in London, conferring together some years ago, about the state of those flocks of which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, found cause to lament the too general neglect of family and practical religion among them. Such a neglect, those fathers could not but lay near to their heart, and forthwith considered what it was proper for them to do in order to excite the negligent to their duty, and to quicken those who were cold or careless in it; this consideration ended in a resolution to write and preach upon the important occasion, and we hope the effects were answerable.* We who now watch for your souls are

* This occurred in 1694, an account of which is given by the Rev. George Hamond, M.A., in his preface to his "*Discourse of Family Worship.*" 18mo. "Some months since another Reverend brother, Mr. Matthew Barker, and myself were desired by the united ministers to draw up a short account of the scripture grounds and reasons of family worship. This was done by that other very judicious person. And I also offered then some hasty undigested thoughts about it. But afterwards I bestowed more time upon that subject, which produced this discourse that I now present to you, not as coming from the united ministers, but in my own name only. And I desire that this may be well observed, that it may appear that my brethren are not responsible for any thing that is faulty or defective therein." It is stated on the title page to have been "undertaken upon the request of the united ministers in and about London."

Besides the "*Discourse on Family Prayer,*" by Mr. Barker, the excellent John Shower published, in 1694, "*Family Religion, in three letters to a friend,*" 18mo. which he states were the substance of what he lately preached on that subject. Speaking of the success of his united effort, he adds, "Divers of our brethren in this city can say the like, and I hope more of the good effects of our agreement to preach on this subject about the same time. Again, 'I did hope some others of my brethren would be prevailed with to print their sermons, and I am glad to hear that it is now doing, or resolved to be done.'"

Such was the cordial fraternal union of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of 1694.—*Editor.*

apprehensive, Sirs, of the same evil in our day; and in faithfulness to God, to you, and ourselves, think it our duty to give you this public warning of your sin and danger. We are sorry and ashamed there should be cause to exhibit such a charge as this against the professors of a pure religion. We hoped you had better learned Christ than to have deserved such a reproof; and had so well understood your duty to God and your families, as not to have needed such an exhortation. We know there are some who make great conscience of family religion amongst us; but, that there is too general a neglect of it, is too evident in fact; and were this only among the men of the world, who have their portion in this life, it would not surprise us; but to observe it among men professing godliness, fills our hearts with grief, and forces us to speak what we wish there were no need for you to hear. We are too nearly concerned in this matter to be any longer silent; your ministers would be chargeable with unfaithfulness, should they overlook such a neglect. To intermeddle in the civil affairs of your families would be criminal in us, but should you take amiss our concern for the religion of them, it would be a crime in you. Ye are our witnesses how much we sympathize with you in cases afflictive, and can you think we shall not lament what we apprehend offensive to God among you?

It is not easy for us to tell you, Sirs, how deeply we are concerned at this great and threatening evil; God has built you a tabernacle, but you have not erected an altar for him; nay, some have pulled down his altar, after spiritual sacrifices had been offered upon it for a long time. You appear on solemn days at God's house, but in your own you acknowledge him not; your children and servants may, for all you, live without God in the world. We hear of no family instruction, no singing the praises of God and the Redeemer among you; nay, not so much as reading the scriptures and prayer. This neglect we have reason to fear is a growing evil, reaching from parents to children, and spreading among both rich and poor, which makes our grief and confusion so much the greater, and puts those words of the disconsolate prophet into our mouths, "O that our heads were water, and our eyes a fountain of tears!"

We would gladly be instrumental in reviving real religion among you, and to that end are desirous to use our interest with you, wisely and seriously to consider the causes and consequences of that neglect we are now lamenting.

The causes of the neglect of family religion we apprehend to be such as these.

1. The ill constitution of families at the first, by unsuitable marriages and relations.

The Israelites had an early caution not to mix with the idolatrous nations; "Thou shalt not make marriages with them, thy daughter thou shalt not give to his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son." (Deut. vii. 3.) The apostle's advice to Christians is likewise much the same; "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness?" (2 Cor. vi. 14.) An unsuitable, is ever like to prove an unhappy match; and what

more unsuitable than to join the pious and profane?—the well-educated and well-disposed person with the loose and profligate? Worldly views, it is to be feared, often overrule you here; but surely such conduct is not to be justified. Is ennobling your blood and advancing your estates a valuable consideration for the loss or hazard of religion and the fear of God?

Will such persons “walk together blameless in God’s commandments,” being heirs of the grace of life, and their prayers not be hindered? You hope, perhaps, your son will teach such relations the fear of God; you may more justly fear, “They will turn away thy son from following him.” (Deut. vii. 4.) Thus Solomon’s heart was turned away from the God of his father. (1 Kings ii. 4.) But we appeal to your own experience; has the church of God been built up this way, or has it not greatly suffered? Have such marriages yielded you the comfort you proposed in them? Have they not introduced a vanity, and pride, and looseness of life into families, till then sober and pious; ruinous at least to religion, if not to every thing else? Such persons are so far from being likely to set up the worship of God in their own houses, that it is well if they prove not the occasion of pulling it down in their father’s houses too. Upon the whole, we recommend the apostle’s caution in this case; “She is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord.” (1 Cor. vii. 39.)

2. Omitting it at the first setting out in the world.

Would young persons begin with God, and use themselves to family worship from the first, they would be likely to proceed with ease and comfort; whereas a neglect at the first, discourages a future attempt, and the longer the neglect is, the greater, usually, is their backwardness. We do, therefore, most earnestly entreat young persons to open their house with family worship. It is a wise and reputable thing, and the way to obtain the blessing of God; it will conciliate the respect of inferiors and equals, and be esteemed by all wise men an exemplary conduct.

3. Excess of modesty and bashfulness of mind.

Some persons have a good will to family religion, who want courage to perform it; they imagine themselves to want capacity, but are, perhaps, the only people who have a mean opinion of their own abilities: this we cannot but think always a fault, and believe it may sometimes be a temptation. It seems to us a strange thing that men should have a very good capacity for conversation and business, and yet be unable to pray. Who knows not that the matter of prayer is large and copious? How many are our family wants and mercies? And, it is to be feared, our family trespasses and temptations not a few. These, we should think, might suggest abundant matter of confession, petition, and praise; but it is more surprising that such as worship God in public seriously, and constantly, and daily converse with his word and their own hearts, should be at a loss to express themselves pertinently upon this occasion. We advise, therefore, that endeavours be used to overcome this unreasonable modesty; but if it be found insuperable, (as we are not able to say how far it may prevail with some tempers,) we then judge it proper

for such persons to use a well chosen form of prayer, for a while at least; and we hope they will find in some time a greater freedom of mind and readiness of expression, and be able to perform their duty in an acceptable manner, without a strict confinement to this; however, in cases of over-modesty and self-diffidence, we can by no means think family worship should be neglected, through a scruple or contempt of forms of prayer.

4. Is not the decay of serious religion, and abatement of zeal in the heads of families, another cause of this neglect?

Too many, we fear, may find cause to reflect with grief and shame upon the love of their espousals; at the first setting out few more zealous, now, perhaps, none more cold. In days past they were early and late with God, both in family and closet devotion; now they are in company when they ought to be at home; and God finds them in their beds when he expected them on their knees. Pardon us, dearly beloved, that we use a freedom with you here. There is cause for a godly jealousy. We can fix our eye upon some in the world who once were flourishing professors, but are now sadly degenerate, and it may be, one of the first visible signs of their apostacy was the neglect of family prayer: and if it be, as we are informed, the custom of heads of families to be late abroad, every night almost at a club or in public company, till some of the family be in bed, and all of them have need to be there, no wonder there is no family worship. We must needs tell you such a practice deserves a warm reproof. It is ill in young persons to be tippling and gaming when they ought to be under the roof and eye of their masters or parents, but for elderly persons, who make a profession of religion, to be thus employed, is still worse. Such an evil example is of very extensive influence, beside the injury hereby done to his mind by the dishonour reflected upon him as head of the family. We entreat, therefore, that this matter be seriously considered; we hope there is not all that ground of fear on this account which some apprehend; but we pray you to remember, that as ever you would avoid an open apostacy, you must take heed of a secret declension from God and duty.

5. Multiplicity of worldly affairs, and inordinate regards to worldly good.

Sure we are, worldly affairs might be so adjusted, and should be so pursued, as to leave room for personal and family religion. Good and wise men will order their affairs with discretion. Christians ought to look at things unseen. The body is more than meat, but the soul is more than both. The hurries of business can be no just excuse for this neglect, unless one fault can be supposed a proper excuse for another; if persons cannot get all the family together, they should call as many as they can. We fear this is often made an excuse, when it might be easily prevented. You need not be told that there is a love of this world inconsistent with the love of God, and that the friendship of it is enmity with God. An over-eager pursuit of this world was always dangerous, and is ever likely to prove ruinous to religion, and fatal to the souls of men.

A caution, therefore, of this kind is always seasonable, and never

more so than at this juncture. The great commotions and sudden changes of things which have lately happened amongst us; the evident hurry and confusion of men's minds; their eager pursuit of worldly good, and the great restlessness of their spirits, do plainly indispose them for the worship and service of God. We wish you, therefore, to consider this, and to put yourselves in mind how great a change one day or night may make in your affairs or families, and thence conclude that the present world ought not to be either first or last in your thoughts, but that you ought to lie down and rise up with God.

These, Sirs, are the more obvious causes of the general neglect of family worship amongst us; we are loath to suppose any thing worse than this in the case; we know, indeed, that should any of you be insincere and hypocritical, having only a form of godliness; should you be chargeable with allowed guiles, and pursue dishonest gain; should you oppress, defraud, or over-reach your neighbour; should you indulge to secret sin, or by imprudence and passion spoil the harmony of your families, and fall into unbecoming heats and jars; a consciousness of such guilt will be very likely to ruin all family religion amongst us. But, beloved, we hope better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.

But whatever are the causes of this neglect, the consequences of it are ill enough; as thus, it were not strange if a disorder in your temporal affairs should follow hereupon. The blessing of God is as necessary to success in business, as all your foresight and industry; now what if this should cease with the other? or what if you have success? but not as any fruit of prayer or with the divine favour or blessing, will that be any comfort to you? To get the world with a curse should be dreaded, and yet so it will be, if religion be left out in the getting.

Again; this neglect may very probably have ill effects upon your families. The constant worship of God in a house serves to keep every thing orderly and peaceful; it unites the hearts of all the inhabitants in the love of God and one another; the natural effects of it are harmony, peace, and love; it will therefore be no wonder if a neglect of this spoil the beauty of your society and stain its glory, and if sensuality, pride, and discord should enter in at that door where family worship is shut out. If you do not perform your duty to God, why should you wonder if inferiors perform not theirs to you? Should friends be less tender, children less dutiful, and servants disorderly and unfaithful, you may but too justly say, this comes of laying down and neglecting family worship.

But however this be, the neglect must have an ill effect upon your own souls. It will be more than probable that it will breed ill habits of mind, and lay too sure a foundation for many after-miscarriages of life. One wrong step is usually followed with another. Having yielded thus far, Satan and the world have a great advantage, and you are laid open to the temptations and snares of both.

Who can tell but that in a little while you will be as seldom in your closet, as now you are in your family? And this will be likely to occasion a less frequent attendance at the Lord's table,

which will also probably draw after it a carelessness and formality in other parts of public worship, and perhaps end in a total neglect of them; nay, more, what we are now warning you of, affects the world as well as the church, and tends to the general corruption of manners in all the relations of life. Religious families will be good in every capacity, but irreligious ones in none; consider, therefore, we beseech you, this great evil, and let the ill influence it has upon the nation and the church of God amongst us, upon relations, families, and your own souls, move you to sober reflections hereupon. You who stand under solemn engagements to God, by your baptismal dedication, and the bonds of a visible profession, and the relation of church-fellowship and communion, must be chargeable with great unfaithfulness in such a neglect as this. May these thoughts revive upon your minds a sense of duty, and re-inflame your zeal for God!

We can hardly think professors of religion in any doubt whether family worship be a duty; we take it for granted that this is a thing most surely believed amongst us, and for this reason are the more at a loss how to account for the so general neglect. Nature itself teaches you this plain truth, and the word of God abundantly confirms and enforces it.

Were we to argue this matter with you, we should call upon you to consider God as the author and constitutor of these societies, and see whether it does not follow from thence that he is to be owned and acknowledged as such. Divine Providence brings you into this relation, builds up your houses, superintends your affairs, preserves you from innumerable evils, and supplies you with all needful good. Now what considerate man can think himself at liberty whether to own his dependence upon God, and obligation to him, *herein*, or not? Your family mercies do surely oblige you to the duty of praise, your wants to that of prayer, and family sins to that of serious and daily confession. The order and peace of these societies entitles God to your devout acknowledgment, and in case of disorder or affliction among them, you ought to be renewed to deep and speedy repentance. Your children and servants claim your instruction, they all fix their eye upon the head of the family to teach them the knowledge of God, the sanctification of the Sabbath-day, and to go before them in personal and relative duties. It is an honour God has put upon the heads of families, and a duty he requires of them to act as priests in their own houses, offering up spiritual sacrifice, holy and acceptable, which is a reasonable service. How can such as live in the daily neglect of family religion and worship read without inward reproach that solemn charge, Deut. vi. 5, 6, 7, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might: and these words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up?" See also from ver. 20, to the end. Let it be considered, farther, what eminent instances holy men of old were of family religion. God speaks it to Abraham's honour,

"I know him that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord." (Gen. xviii. 19.)

Joshua assembling the tribes of Israel to relate God's mercies to them, and renew their covenant with him, looks as great as when he stood at the head of their armies: nor does sacred history ever give you a greater instance of his courage, than that resolution was of his piety. "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." (Josh. xxiv. 15.)

Job had that concern for the honour of God, the welfare of his family, and the preservation of real religion in it, that he "sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning to offer burnt-offerings, according to the number of them all;" (Job i. 5.) and it is observed, "thus did Job continually."

David is an excellent example of family religion, when he says, "I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way: I will walk within my house with a perfect heart." (Ps. ci. 2.)

Our great Lord and Master was a pattern of the most solemn and fervent devotion; he taught us by his example to be instant in prayer; his disciples were his family, and with them he prayed.

It is recorded of Cornelius that he was a devout man; and as an instance hereof, he is said to have "feared God with all his house," and that he "prayed to God alway." (Acts x. 2.)

Nymphas had a church in his house; and family religion, were it well and wisely managed, would be likely to make our houses nurseries for the church of God, and plantations for heaven.

To conclude. The morning and evening sacrifice being a standing institution under the law, and praying always with all prayer being an express precept of the gospel, we hope professed Christians will be persuaded to look upon family worship as their duty, and not satisfy themselves in any longer neglect of it.

But you will hear more of this matter from the pulpit. The ministers of London intend, in some convenient time, to preach upon this subject by common consent. This was formerly done by the brethren of both denominations, and is now designed as an expression of hearty zeal and concern for the interests of serious religion, under such visible decays amongst us.*

* The Body of the Ministers of the Three Denominations in and about London and Westminster was not formed till July, 1727. It therefore appears that the union which took place between the English Presbyterians and Congregational brethren, upon the Heads of Agreement in 1691, continued in operation for at least 29 years, i. e. till the date of the publication of this Tract; and that, be it observed, is a year after the celebrated Salter's Hall Assembly, which took place on the 12th of February, 1718-19, and which is alleged to have dissolved the union.

DR. BENNETT'S REPLY TO DR. SMITH ON SOLOMON'S
SONG.

Mr. Editor,

INSTEAD of confining myself to a reply to Dr. Smith's *last* answer, I shall endeavour to make this controversy more profitable by reviewing *all* that he has said against Solomon's Song. It is not easy to follow his track, because he first dilates pretty largely against the book, pp. 415—418, July number; and then meets the arguments in its favour by reasons for the other side, taking advantage of the right which he who makes a motion has to be heard twice, see pp. 421—427. I regret that he begins by arguing against the allegory, as it serves to enlist prejudice against reason. The impartial course would have been to examine first the evidence for the canonicity of the Song. But I must follow where he leads; though I have already given some replies which he has not noticed. Dr. Smith says, "the authority for putting on the Song an allegorical interpretation, rests on no scriptural foundation." I have shown that it may be supported by the acknowledged allegorical interpretation of a previous portion of scripture, the 45th Psalm, which is but an epitome of this Song. The assertion that, "unless a divine sanction and direction could be produced, no man has a right to assume it," I am not quite sure that I understand. If it be a demand of a divine sanction and direction for the allegorical interpretation to be contained *in the Song itself*; then we might ask, where is such direction to be found in the allegory contained in the 80th Psalm? For aught that appears, it might be a lamentation over a choice species of vine brought from Egypt, and suffered to deteriorate and be destroyed in Canaan. Dr. Smith may plead that the mention of the *heathen*, in v. 8, points to the interpretation; but as this is the only instance in which a *proper* term is employed instead of the *allegorical*, it may be doubted whether the allegory is not spoiled by our translation, and whether the radical idea of *body* is not alluded to here: "thou hast cast out other bodies to plant this." But admitting this slight hint to be a divine sanction to the allegorical interpretation; we have an equivalent for it in the Song: "the *upright* love thee." The Septuagint has considered the plural as equivalent to the abstract idea of rectitude; but even then we are taught that it is the *love*, which holiness, wherever it exists, bears to Christ, which is the theme of this Song. If, however, Dr. S. does not contend that the divine key must be found in the allegory itself, but would say that other parts of scripture show Israel to have been the vine brought out of Egypt; then we can show, that other parts of scripture, as Psalm lxxii, make Solomon a type of Christ, and exhibit Christ as the bridegroom whose bride is the church. Psalm xlv. Ephes. v.

Dr. Smith next inveighs against allegorical interpretations in general, as capable of making any thing out of any thing; and, strange to say, as invented by the Alexandrian Jews, for the support of Platonism and the heathen mythology. This, he

says, is seen in Philo, and many of the early Christians. Nothing can be more incorrect than these statements. In the first place, allegories and their interpretations (for the latter must necessarily attend the former) were no inventions of the Alexandrian Jews. The Jews might fairly say, "why give us the sinister credit of this invention? We should rather have expected that you would have accused us of stealing a golden key from your apostle Paul, when we read such a passage as this in his epistle to the Galatians iv. 21—31. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond maid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bond woman, was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bond woman and her son: for the son of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond woman, but of the free." "Has he not also largely allegorized our law, in his epistle to our Hebrew nation, where he has attempted to prove that our law was a shadow of your christian religion. Was not all this written before the period when we are supposed to have been so dark as to foist the allegory of the Song into our canon, and to have attempted, by our platonistic allegories, to prop up the heathen mythology which we abhor?" In fact, allegory is founded in nature, arising out of the association of ideas, which produces comparisons, similes, metaphors. Allegories are but more lengthened metaphors. The inspired writers have given the first specimens of allegories; so far are these from being of heathen or rabbinical origin. To what lengths would this paper extend, if I were to quote all the instances which resemble those contained in Psalm xxiii., lxxx., xlv., lxxii.; Isaiah v.; Ezek. xxiii.?

That the Alexandrine Jews designed to prop the credit of the heathen mythology is a strange notion, contrary to all that is known of the Jews. What Dr. Smith says of the inconsistency between the boldness of the imagery of the Song and the humble devotion of a Christian, will be noticed in a subsequent page.

In the next place, he argues that the allegorical interpretation must be arbitrary, depending upon every man's fancy. This, to a certain extent, applies to every allegory, and we have seen that the scriptures abound in that figure. In the Revelation, as well as in the prophecies of the Old Testament, this figure is employed as a prophetic symbol, which has indeed been interpreted in a very arbitrary

trary way, according to every one's fancy. But are we, therefore, to reject these prophetic images? Dr. Smith may say, that there are rules of interpretation. True. Then the figure, or its meaning, is no longer arbitrary, left to every one's fancy. In the Song, the love of Christ and the church is the key, and he that is not in possession of it should not pretend to interpret: while he that knows this love will be guided aright. "The wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein." If some have erred; have they not equally erred in their interpretation of other scriptures? The apostle's declaration, which forms the substance of the epistle to the Hebrews, that "the law is a shadow of good things to come," has been abused by vagrant fancies, as much as the great principle of the Song of Solomon. If we reject this, we cannot shut the door against the abuse of the figure that the church is Christ's beloved bride, as long as the 45th Psalm is acknowledged to be an inspired part of the Old Testament, and the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians is admitted to be an inspired portion of the New. What fancies have been betrayed by the interpreters of the Apocalypse! I think I have met with more foolish allegorizing on other parts of scripture than on the Canticles. But it is admitted, by all reasonable men, that to argue, from the abuse of a thing, against its use, is not valid.

Origen is adduced as a proof of the mischief of allegorizing. But while he is lauded as so "good and upright," he meets with hard measure, it being represented as doubtful whether he admits the *facts* of scripture. No one can read his answer to Celsus, and doubt this. He is said to treat them with great irreverence. Some would bring the same charge against saying of a part of the writings of Moses, "'a little popular song, about the opening of a well,' and the song of an Amorite bard!" What Dr. S. quotes from Origen concerning the spiritual or evangelical import of the Levitical institutes, amounts to no more, when candidly taken, than what the apostle says, that "the Holy Ghost this signifies, that the high priest's entrance into the holy of holies but once a year, was a figure of the way into the holiest of all not being manifest, while the first tabernacle was standing." It is the general conviction of Christians, that the evangelical reference of the Levitical ceremonies is that which exhibits them as worthy of the God who gave them. Dr. Smith says, "Origen has shown this lamentable spirit, even with relation to the gospel history: a serious warning against the love of allegory!" Yes; and a serious warning against the hatred of allegory, which might make us reject the Gospel history, as well as Solomon's Song, because they have both been allegorized. Dr. Smith's next paragraph is intended to show that Solomon was not the writer of the Song, though the one which follows attempts to prove that he wrote it after he had tarnished his glory. (Cong. Mag. July, pp. 416, 417.) But I reserve my remarks on these passages for that part of my paper which will apply to the internal evidence of the book.

Let us now consider Dr. Smith's argument against the canonicity of the book. (Page 422, July, and page 484, Dec.)

"The total silence of our Lord and the apostles, in relation to this book, appears to authorize the supposition that it was little known or regarded by the Jews of Palestine, and that both our great Teacher and his inspired servants were not desirous of raising it out of obscurity or oblivion." This seems to admit that the Song had been classed with the inspired writings, before the time of our Lord; for if it is supposed merely to have existed as a part of the profane literature of the Jews, why say that our Lord was not desirous of raising it out of obscurity? No one supposes that he would call any common treatise out of obscurity. Again, in the number for December, Dr. Smith says, "the book of Canticles I conceive to have been *usually* absent from the repositories" (of the divine writings); for he "supposes that complete collections of the Old Testament scriptures were exceedingly rare," and therefore "regards the book as having been silently rejected by our divine Lord." These passages concede the point that the book in question had been admitted into the canon by the Jews, before the time of Christ, who is supposed to have contented himself with silence, though that is usually considered to give consent.

Who would have expected, after this, to find Dr. Smith saying, "about the opening or middle of the third century, I conceive to have been the period when a book, which had not been recognized in the apostolic age, was intruded into the collection of the Old Testament writings. There was a dark period, when an opportunity was likely to be afforded for the annexation of this ancient Hebrew book by the unbelieving Jews to their collection of the sacred writings." Here are two contradictory propositions—the book was received by the Jews before the time of our Lord, who, by his silence, expressed his disapprobation—and the book was first admitted by the Jews in the dark period of Hadrian's reign! Contradictions cannot both be true; though they may both be false. Such statements would, in a writer of less candour, be thought to intimate a determination to reject the book at any rate. Hard is the lot of an advocate, who has to work his way against contradictions.

But I pay homage to truth, when I consider, first, the opinion that Solomon's Song *was* in the Jewish canon in the time of our Lord. The Jews were favoured, after the return from Babylon, with inspired prophets, and from them the church learned to settle the canon. Malachi, whom the Jews call the seal of the prophets, closes the Old Testament with a promise of the coming of Christ, and a charge to remember, in the mean time, the law. To suppose that the church was left by him in uncertainty concerning the inspired scriptures, that were to be its guide till Christ came, is preposterous. To imagine that the Jews, after ceasing to enjoy the ministry of the prophets, added another book to the collection sanctioned by the inspired men, is contrary to that reverence which Christ declares they had for the scriptures, of which he says, "in them *ye think* ye have eternal life."

But Dr. Smith says, we should guard against transferring our modern and familiar idea of a book to the manners of former times. The fact is, that, together with an *additional* modern idea, we have

also substantially the same idea on this subject as the ancients. We are familiar with the separation, as well as the collection, of the sacred writings. We have our Bible and Testament apart, as well as united. We have our Psalter, and our gospels, as separate pocket companions. But whenever we speak of *the scriptures*, we drop the idea of the separate parts with which we may have been familiar, and think only of the whole. It is manifest, by the language of our Lord and the apostles, that though they sometimes had particular portions in view, yet, when they spoke of the scriptures, they referred to the whole, as completely as *we* should who are accustomed to see them bound up in one volume, which *they* were not.

Dr. Smith speaks largely of their manuscripts, and rolls, and chests, and the paucity of copies of the scriptures, as if he could prove it all. Much of this, however, is mere conjecture, and I think it is not *all* probable conjecture. The appeals of Christ and his apostles to the scriptures do not warrant the conclusion that the Jews knew so little of them as the following passage would lead us to believe. "The labour and expense necessary to produce such rolls, together with the absence of literary habits, and the long-continued corruption of the Jewish nation, produced that awful degree of prevailing ignorance and debasement to which the New Testament bears witness." *We* have an awful degree of ignorance and debasement in our nation; but it does not follow that we have few bibles, or that it is not well known what books constitute the scriptures. There were many things that formed a counterpoise to those which Dr. Smith has adduced. The inspired writings of the Old Testament were the *national* charter of the Jews, who gloried in them as their peculiar treasure, and despised all other literature when compared with Moses and the prophets. At the time of Christ's coming, the Jews were, indeed, sunken into great carnality; but they gloried in the *letter* in proportion as they had lost the *spirit* of their religion. They were expecting a deliverer, promised in their scriptures, to save them from the Romans, whose yoke was mortifying to the spiritual pride of the nation. The hints we have in the gospels and epistles prove that the Jews were familiar with the letter of the scriptures, including the three great divisions which the Hebrew Bible now exhibits, the law, the prophets, and the Chetubim, or hagiographa, i. e. the inspired writings not included in the law and prophets. Not only did the leaders of the nation whom Herod consulted point out correctly the passage in the prophet Micah (ch. v. ver. 2.) which predicted that Christ must be born in Bethlehem, but the *people* showed that they had correct knowledge on this point. When Christ spake of his approaching death, the *people* answered him, "we have heard out of the law, that Christ abideth for ever;" alluding to Psalm cx., "thou art a priest for ever," which, by the way, shows that they ascribed the authority of law to all the scriptures, as well as to the Pentateuch, which bore that name by emphasis: thus Christ says, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods?" which is taken from Psalm lxxii.

I cannot recollect an instance in which the gospels, or epistles, point out such ignorance of the letter of scripture among the Jews,

as Dr. Smith assumes; but I am sure, that both Christ and his apostles appeal to the Jews, as men who knew the word, but were destitute of its spirit. Dr. Smith seems to have made no account of the better part of the nation, "the holy seed that was the substance thereof." "At this very time, there was a remnant according to the election of grace;" and there had been "times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," as well as a "long-continued corruption." The prophets Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, as well as the faithful rulers, Ezra, and Nehemiah, had been followed by the Maccabees, who wrought miracles of holy valour, and restored the glory of Israel. The apostle is, with good reason, thought to have classed them among those who by faith obtained a good report. When Christ came, there was a Simeon, who, under the special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, expected to see, before he died, the Messiah long promised; and there was Anna, a prophetess: these spake of Christ to a faithful company, "who looked for redemption in Israel." When Christ called his disciples, they showed themselves familiar with scripture, and spoke of "finding him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets wrote." I appeal to every christian reader, to judge whether there is not a host of positive proofs from scripture that Dr. Smith's view of the ignorance and corruption of the nation is overcharged, or at least is a one-sided view of things.

But, to follow his march a little farther; I quote the following sentence, which contains, I think, the substance of his reply to my repeated appeal to our Lord's sanction of the Jewish canon. "Now I believe, that, when our Lord and his apostles spoke of the scriptures, they habitually referred to those divine writings, which were familiarized to the people, by being read every sabbath-day in the synagogue. The book of Canticles I conceive to have been usually absent from the repositories, and to have been scarcely known to the generality of the Jewish people." Let the anxious student of scripture carefully notice the conjectural character of this statement, which forms the soul of Dr. Smith's reply to my appeals; and let it be seriously observed how it deprives us of our most valuable testimony to the Old Testament, the sanction of the Sovereign Lord of the Church. It is first guessed, without a shadow of evidence, that the Jewish synagogues did not usually possess all the scriptures; it is then said, I *conceive* the book of Canticles to have been usually absent; and it is finally taken for granted, that our Lord, when appealing to the scriptures, referred only to imperfect collections! I think it would not be easy to meet with such another collection of assumptions on such a vital question. If Dr. Smith had been pressing upon a Jew, Christ's appeal to their scriptures, and had met with such a reply as he has given, he would have exposed its futility. This, however, is now my task.

In the first place, then, as to the probability that the whole of the scriptures of the Old Testament were commonly in the hands of the Jews, and in the possession of the synagogues. The last of the prophets closed the inspired ministry, by appeals to the former prophets, and by a solemn charge to the Jews to attend to the word

which had been given to them, till Messiah should come. It is a historic fact, that the Jews struggled to retain their scriptures, in spite of persecution, and in the face of death. Forbidden by Antiochus to read the law, they took to reading the prophets; and afterwards they retained both lessons. In the triumphant era of the earliest Maccabees, they restored their worship to its pristine glory, and there were long periods of such prosperity as gave them abundant opportunities of multiplying copies of the scripture. The high priests became the sovereign princes of the nation, and their religion was Lord of the ascendant. Their synagogues were set up *for the sole purpose of reading the scriptures*. All the Levitical ceremonies of sacrifice and oblation were confined to the temple. That the synagogues had more of the sacred writings than the *Lam*, we know; for "they delivered to our Lord, in the synagogue at Nazareth, the book of the prophet Isaiah." As "Moses had, of old time, in every city, them that preached him, being read every Sabbath-day in the synagogues;" so Paul, in the synagogue at Antioch, in Pisidia, shows that the prophets included, not merely what we understand by that term, but the rest of the scriptures, or what we call the Hagiographa, which now contains the Psalms and Solomon's Song. For, "after the reading of the law and the prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent to Paul and his companions, saying, ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on." Then Paul stood up and appealed, not only to the writings of Moses, but to the book of Joshua, and Judges, and Samuel, 1st book, chap. xiii. ver. 11, and to the book of Psalms, and to the prophets Isaiah and Habakkuk. Now all this was an appeal to scriptures that were supposed to be in their hands, in a synagogue far from Judea. Can we suppose that at the headquarters of their religion the Jews were worse furnished with the scriptures? An inspired man, like Simeon, and a prophetess, like Anna, must have taught their nation to value the scriptures as their great treasure. The *expense* of procuring a complete collection was nothing, when compared with the sums which the Jews expended upon their religion, in sacrifices and offerings; and to suppose that the synagogues would not be emulous on this point, and vie with each other in their copies of the divine writings, is contrary to all that we read of them in the New Testament, and all that we know of them now. The chief of all the distinctions of their nation, the apostle says, was, that "to them were committed the oracles of God." He does not hint that they were unfaithful to that trust, or exposed these inspired writings to the hazard of perishing, by ignorance, or negligence, or by parsimony failing to procure complete collections. When we meet with a *house* that contains no Bible, or one that has a large part torn out, or find only the New Testament, or a Psalter, we do not fail to express something like reproof. But what should we say of a congregation in such a state of destitution? It is true that printing makes it easier for us to possess the whole scriptures; but then it is equally true that their whole was much smaller than ours; for we have the New Testament added to the Old. Nor should it be forgotten, that among us a large mass of

literature too much divides attention, and prevents that exclusive study of the scriptures which was the national peculiarity of the Jews. It may be supposed that they had something equivalent; because Christ reproaches them with making void the commandment of God by their traditions. But these were all comments on the scriptures, rabbinical interpretations, which kept attention directed to the text, though in a perverted way.

When a Greek version was wanted, it included the whole scriptures; for if the account of the *simultaneous* translation be rejected, we have no reason to doubt that the whole collection of the divine writings was translated into Greek before the time of our Lord. Dr. Smith argues, indeed, that the Greek contained *more* than all that was inspired, but this will not sustain his conjecture that the Jews had generally *less* than all they *thought* inspired. The Hellenists, or Jews who spoke Greek, were then in possession of the whole; and can we suppose that those of Palestine, who considered themselves Jews by emphasis, would be content with partial collections, especially in their synagogues, of which the sole object and exercise was the reading of the scriptures? Often as we find Christ and the apostles preaching in the synagogues, we never hear the slightest hint of reproach for not possessing a whole Bible, such as we certainly should give in a congregation found thus deficient. But the great Teacher and his inspired ministers appeal to books contained in each of the three great divisions of the Old Testament scripture, the law, the prophets, and the Chetubim, or holy writings not belonging to either of the former. It was always assumed that the Jewish hearers were acquainted with all their scriptures. In opposition, therefore, to Dr. Smith's conjectures, I think I may say, we have evidence that the Jews did generally possess the whole; and that complete collections of the inspired writings were found in most, and perhaps in every one, of their synagogues. Josephus says, I think in his Jewish war, that an insurrection arose from the indignation of the Jews, because a Roman soldier had torn contemptuously a copy of their law in some obscure town, or village, and the Roman commander, fearing worse consequences, put the soldier to death.

But it is next assumed, that the book of Canticles was generally absent. Those who admit the force of what I have just said, will consider this to be virtually answered, especially as it is advanced without proof. That the Song is not absent from the Greek version is certain; and I suppose it will be admitted that this was made before the time of our Lord. As I am arguing now against Dr. Smith's *first* hypothesis, that the Jews had admitted the Song into their canon, but without our Redeemer's sanction; what reason can be assigned why they should not generally possess it, along with the other sacred writings? That there is nothing in it contrary to the prejudices of the Jews, Dr. Smith supposes, when he accuses them of foisting it into the canon. Why then should they be supposed to contradict themselves, at once admitting and rejecting it, receiving it as inspired and neglecting to place it among the inspired? Have we any example of such conduct? What part of scripture have the

Jews treated thus? They have now, in their synagogues, inspired scriptures which condemn themselves; and yet we are called to believe they once virtually excluded a book which rather flatters their national pride? For there are in the Song many things concerning Solomon and Jerusalem, and the daughters of Zion, which must always have been gratifying to a Jew. The Platonism of Philo is mentioned by Dr. Smith, and the Song is supposed to be a proof of their love of allegory. This spirit must have disposed them to cherish rather than slight the disputed book, and though Dr. Smith supposes that the mania of allegory became rampant in the days of Hadrian, he finds it first in Philo.

But now we come to Dr. Smith's hypothesis, that "our Lord and his apostles spoke only of the scriptures that were familiarized to the people by being read every Sabbath-day in the synagogues." As my opponent supposes that complete collections were very rare, and the people very ignorant of them, Christ's appeal is rendered utterly uncertain in its application, and may apply to very few books; so that this valuable testimony to the Jewish canon is nearly destroyed. But I have endeavoured to restore it to its due honour and valuable use. I have shown reason for concluding that Christ appealed to the same collection of writings as we have under the name of the Old Testament. That Christ appealed to the Pentateuch will scarcely be denied. That he appealed to Samuel we find Matt. xii. 3. That he appealed to the Psalms and to the prophets we know from various texts.

To suppose that Christ referred, only to the scriptures which the Jews had in common use, while they carelessly retained but a portion of what even they themselves deemed inspired, is a marvellous hypothesis. This is making, not only their conduct, but their sin, Christ's rule! Who of us would act thus? If we knew that men neglected the scriptures, and had but a part of them in constant use, should we, therefore, when appealing to scripture, confine ourselves to what they chose to read? By the scriptures we could never intend any thing but what they ought to have, the whole scripture. It is in this way Dr. Smith, and every other christian minister, refers to scripture, whatever may be the carelessness or ignorance of the hearers.

We must now examine the position, that Christ, knowing the Jews had taken the Canticles into their canon, but disapproving, showed, "by his total silence, that he was not desirous of raising it out of obscurity or oblivion." This must strike every one who reveres Christ as a strange supposition. The Redeemer, knowing the importance attached to the word of God, and the solemn charge given, not to add to or diminish therefrom, was silent, when he knew they had added to the inspired scriptures a human production! Dr. Smith does not think it enough to be silent on such an occasion; for he has spoken out, not only in a work on another subject, but in a periodical, which is made an additional vehicle of his censure on the Song, by circulating just that part of *his* book which condemns the book in question. Is he more faithful to the honour of scripture than his Master? Our Redeemer appealed to the scriptures without limita-

tion, and as Dr. S. supposes that the Canticles had then been admitted to share the honour of the inspired writings, *some* must have known that fact; and if those who were ignorant were not injured by this indiscriminate appeal, all those who did know must have concluded that Christ appealed to all that had been placed among the scriptures. Our Redeemer knew, also, that his language would be (as it is) considered a sanction to whatever we find in the Jewish scriptures.

It is, besides, to be observed, that Christ not merely spoke of the scriptures, but of *all* things written in them, Luke xxiv. 44. It is true that this is especially applied to what concerned himself; but the reason is obvious—because he was then speaking of himself; and his language would naturally lead to the conclusion, that all things spoken in scripture on every other subject must be fulfilled. Did not such language require that he should warn them against taking for scripture what has no claim to that title, or to any fulfilment?

Our Redeemer, moreover, expressly referred to the *Jews'* opinion of scripture in a way that afforded such an opportunity of noticing a false opinion as he could not have suffered to let slip. "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think, ye yourselves judge ye have eternal life, and these are they that testify of me." Could he have spoken thus, if they themselves judged they had eternal life in the book of Canticles, when they had not? Christ declared they had eternal life in the scriptures; and they, according to Dr. Smith's hypothesis, which I am now considering, deemed the Canticles a part of the scriptures. So far, then, was Christ's silence from leaving the Canticles to fall into oblivion, that it left that book in quiet possession of the place it had obtained among the inspired scriptures, and has had the same effect in all succeeding ages. Who can believe that he would have acted thus, if he had disapproved the book as an impious addition, of base alloy, to that word which is better than silver or gold? He that condemned the traditions which made void the word would not have failed to deal out a still heavier censure on an unauthorised addition to the word itself.

Dr. Smith candidly says, that "to a negative argument like this much weight could not be attached, unless the case were such as rendered some mention or allusion in a high degree probable; such is the case before us." He thinks that the union between Christ and the Church, which is supposed to be the theme of Solomon's Song, could not but be mentioned by Christ. Many things of this kind have been said, with great confidence, to little purpose; perhaps by myself also in this controversy. Numerous scriptures and topics have been omitted by Christ, that we should have thought he would certainly have mentioned. If we are to judge from thence, that Christ did not approve these things, we shall judge very falsely. I appeal to one topic far more likely to be mentioned by him than Solomon's Song—"that the law was a shadow of good things to come." When we consider the manner in which Paul has unfolded this principle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and how appropriate it was to the Hebrews—how it

reconciles us to a suffering Messiah, the great stumbling-block to the Jews, we might say, it was next to impossible that the Great Teacher should omit all reference to it in his discourses to the Jews. But the facts of the case strike us dumb. The law *was* designed to shadow the good things to come by Christ, and he did *not* say so. Dr. Smith may say, "there was too much of allegory in the parallel that Paul pursues, to be admitted as argument by those who did not believe in Christ, and therefore Christ wisely left it to be unfolded by his apostle to those who already believed. The scriptures to which Christ appealed were fitter for his unbelieving audience, and the allegorical interpretation of the law was reserved for the ministry of the apostles in the believing church." Exactly so. The Song of Solomon was not a part of scripture to be appealed to by Christ. There can be little doubt but the Jews of that age interpreted the allegory in the spirit of the Targum on the Song, and therefore the true interpretation of it would not have been stringent with them. It requires a believing audience, filled with the great truth that Christ is the bridegroom and the church his bride; and till men are come to this state, it is vain to teach them from the Canticles. This would be doing what Christ forbade, "casting pearls before swine." For the same reason our Lord did not appeal to the same allegory in the 45th Psalm; and by Dr. Smith's process we should reject this also. Not that I think it so certain that Christ never quoted Canticles. I rather think he did; for in reading the Song, to see if I could discover any such allusion, I was struck with the words "things new and old laid up in store." Canticles vii. 13. Now there is a peculiarity in this expression that has fixed it in the memory of all who are familiar with the words of Christ, who says "the good householder brings out of his treasure things new and old." Matt. xiii. 52. It is not probable that this is accidental coincidence; for it is not a mere verbal resemblance, but the sentiment is the same, though it is not a common one; that provision is laid up for the church, and that neither all old things, nor all new, are to be administered for our benefit. I found, afterwards, that this text in the Song was given among the parallel passages to Matthew. I cannot expect it to have much influence on Dr. Smith, but others will reflect, that as Christ's direct quotations of scripture are not very numerous, and as this language is remarkable, the probability is on the side of intentional quotation.

Let us examine Dr. Smith's *second* hypothesis: that the book was *not* admitted into the canon before the time of our Lord, but in the age of Hadrian, about the opening or middle of the third century. Dr. Smith says, "this I conceive to have been the period, in some part of which, a book which had not been recognized in the apostolic age, was intruded into the collection of Old Testament writings." If Dr. Smith is satisfied with this theory, why did he not content himself with it? It would have saved him from making suppositions not very honourable to our Lord, and saved his opponents the trouble of replying to strange conjectures.

Dr. Smith then supposes the Jews, in this dark period, to have added a book to their canon. Though this is, perhaps, the best

position that my opponent could take; bad is the best. It is contrary to all we know of the Jews. Josephus had previously declared that "they had, in so many ages, never dared to add, or take away, a letter." We know that modern Jews, in their worst state, have not added, and would not add, another book to the collection they have received from their fathers. We have every reason to conclude that their wickedness takes the opposite turn of superstition and spiritual pride, piqueing themselves on their inspired writings, idolizing the letter, and perverting it into a basis for false glosses and rabbinical comments. Even Dr. Smith does not seem to suppose that the Jews have been guilty of this crime of adding to the scriptures, in any other instance; at least I am willing to give him credit for not ascribing the same origin to the supposed canonicity of any other books of the Old Testament. He ought, therefore, to have adduced good evidence to prove them guilty of the crime with which he charges them in this one instance.

What reason can be assigned for their supposed departure from their ordinary conduct, for the sake of adding this Song to the canon? What is there in the disputed book that may be supposed to have furnished the inducement? It does not favour their excessive doating on the ceremonies of the Law of Moses. On the contrary, it sanctions the christian principle, that love is the fulfilling of the law, and confirms our Lord's eulogium on the wise answer of a scribe, "not far from the kingdom of God," that "to love the Lord our God with all our heart, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices." Even the Targum makes the Canticles a display of the love that exists between God and Israel. The Song contains nothing that can be construed against the Saviour whom the Jews had rejected; and they knew that the Christians considered it, not only as divinely inspired, but also as a triumphant exhibition of the love of the crucified One to us, and our love to him as our Redeemer. Dr. Smith supposes Origen to have made this known as a christian dogma, and thus conceives that the Jews followed in the wake of the Christians, and admitted into the Old Testament canon a book which they had not previously adopted, as if the synagogue submitted to be taught by the church which it abhorred, what were the oracles of God committed to the once favoured nation.

But why is the third century selected for the era of the intrusion of this book into the canon? Because the Jews were then dark and furious, and the separation between them and the Christians became complete. It had become complete long before, and if any definite period must be mentioned, it was towards the end of the first century, when Jerusalem was destroyed. But just this period, when the separation, according to Dr. Smith, became complete, is chosen as that in which the Jews took a leaf out of the Christian's book, and foisted into the Old Testament the Canticles which the Christians had already received as an integral part of the oracles of God committed to the Jews! Was there ever a more improbable hypothesis? But the reign of Hadrian, when the Jews had received a second proof of their being forsaken of God, is supposed

to be the period in which they added a new book to those which had been given by special visitations from heaven, while God honoured them by raising up prophets in Israel! Must not the whole nation have enquired, "how came this book here?" Has God again visited his people, and raised up a prophet among us? But they could not suppose it a new book; for they of Alexandria knew it was in the Septuagint and in the christian canon, and the only inquiry would be, by what new light, or new authority, that book, which had never before, as Dr. Smith thinks, belonged to their canon, was now received into it. That the Christians had received it, would rather be with the Jews a reason for rejecting it; and how were they to be induced to think that their ancestors, who presided over the Jewish church when it was in its national glory, were all wrong in rejecting, and the Christians all right in adopting it? Here we cannot say even *Credat Judeus Apella*.

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, is placed by Cave in the year 170, and was supposed by some to have been that "angel of the church of Sardis," to whom one of the seven apocalyptic epistles was sent. But though this would have made him a pastor of a church for seventy years, it is probable that he was born before the Apostle John died; for the erroneous opinion could scarcely have arisen, unless Melito had been known to have lived to a great age. He is highly praised as a spiritual man, who was deemed a prophet. That he was not one who took things upon credit is manifest; for he travelled into Palestine to search out the true canon of scripture. He wrote many books which are lost, but, happily, Eusebius has preserved some fragments, and one of great value in this controversy. In an address to one Onesimus, Melito says, "Since, from your zeal for the word, you have often requested selections from the law and the prophets concerning the Saviour and our whole faith, and as it was your wish to know accurately the ancient scriptures, (to learn the accuracy (exact state) of the ancient books,) what was their number and what their order, I have laboured to effect this; knowing your diligence concerning the faith, and your love of scriptural learning, and that, above all, you prefer these things through your ardent desire towards God, striving for the everlasting salvation. Having gone up, therefore, into the east, and being at the place where it (*i. e.* the salvation) was preached and accomplished, and having accurately learned the books of the Old Testament, I have sent them to you as under: of which these are the names. Those of Moses five: Genesis; Exodus; Leviticus; Numbers; Deuteronomy; Joshua, son of Nun; Judges; Ruth; four books of Kings; (we call the two former Samuel) two books of Chronicles; the Psalms of David; the Proverbs of Solomon, which is Wisdom; Ecclesiastes; the Song of Songs; Job; the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah; the twelve (minor) prophets in one book; Daniel; Ezekiel; Ezra: from which I have also made selections arranged in six books." Eusebius' Eccl. History, book ix. chap. 26.

As this is the most ancient christian catalogue which we possess of the books of the Old Testament, I have given it complete, to render

this controversy the more useful to those who may not be well informed, or well furnished with books. Here, then, is a man who may have seen that apostle who lived long enough to set his seal to the whole canon of the New Testament, giving us the result of an enquiry into the canon of the Old, so diligent, that he went for that purpose to the country where Christ lived with his apostles, the Jewish church ended, and the Christian began. He furnished this catalogue to satisfy the ardent thirst of another Christian for this kind of knowledge. Researches so anxious and laborious assure us that the first Christians were fully awake to the importance of the question. To treat them, therefore, as unworthy to be heard, is no sign of superior wisdom. It should be known and noticed, also, that Eusebius records this as "a catalogue of the universally received books of the Old Testament," by a man whom he praises, as one who "flourished worthily." Thus we connect two distant periods of the Christian church, each very important: that which followed the apostolic age, and that which witnessed the civil establishment of Christianity. Melito had been thought, though inaccurately, the angel of the church of Sardis, and Eusebius lived in the days of Constantine and Constantius. Melito gives no hint that the catalogue he brought from Palestine differs from what he had before received; and Eusebius says, it is the catalogue of the books that were universally owned. Whatever, then, may be said of apocryphal additions made by Christians to the Old Testament, amounts to nothing against this most ancient catalogue, characterised as it is by Eusebius. This catalogue not only connects a church to which Christ sent an epistle, and that early period when its pastor was thought by some to have been the very one addressed by the Spirit, and to have been an inspired prophet, with the age of Constantine; but it also connects the Old Testament canon of the Asiatic churches with that of the churches where Christ and the apostles ministered; connects them by Melito's journey, and by the testimony of Eusebius, who was of Cesarea.

It also demands special notice, that Melito and Eusebius speak of the *books of the Old Testament*, just as we do, including a whole collection of books under one comprehensive and generic denomination, *the Old Testament*. But whence did they derive this manner of speaking on which some important consequences hang? It does not appear to have been derived from the Jews; for they speak of the law and the prophets and Chetubim; but I am not aware that they ever did, or ever do speak of the Old Testament, which implies an admission they are not likely to make. The phrase seems to have been in familiar use so early as the days of Melito. Now we find it employed by the apostle Paul, and from the abundant use which the earliest Christians made of the divine writings, we may reasonably conclude, that they took the phrase from the apostle's letter to the Corinthians. We have seen the meaning which the Christians in Melito's age attached to the Old Testament, that it signified the complete collection of the scriptures given to the Jewish church. May we not naturally conclude that they derived the meaning, as well as the phrase, from the apostle? From the use made of it by

one who lived so near the apostolic age, and who travelled to search into the canon of scripture among the churches of Palestine, we might fairly suppose so. I know it has been said that Paul means, by the Old Testament, only the writings of Moses, because he says, "to this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; for unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is on their heart." 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15. But I hope to show that the mention of Moses cannot prove that Paul included the Pentateuch alone under the denomination of the Old Testament, and that we have reason to conclude he employed that term in the modern latitude. Any man might, in the present day, say "the Jews never read the Old Testament but under a vail, for while they read Moses, the vail is on their hearts;" first referring to the whole Bible, and then confirming the general assertion by specifying that which the Jews regard as the most important part. If, with our modern sense of the term Old Testament, we might speak thus, why might not the apostle Paul? Since we find that one so near to the apostolic age as Melito, used the *term* Old Testament in the most comprehensive sense, deriving it, as we believe, from the apostle, what should hinder us from concluding that this *sense* also was apostolic? But as there is no reason *against* this conclusion, there is much *for* it. The writings of Moses were not the only parts of the Old Testament read by the Jews, either in private or public; nor the only portions whose meaning was hidden from them by the vail on their hearts; but "the voices of the prophets they knew not," because the vail was on their hearts in reading the 53d of Isaiah and the 22d Psalm. The apostle doubtless referred to these, also, when he said "the vail was on their hearts in the reading of the Old Testament. Thus the earliest Christians learned to call the whole Jewish scriptures by that name; and Melito enquired what they were, their number, and their order, and has informed us that they included Solomon's Song, in the order of the third book of Solomon. This song we find placed by Melito in the same way as by us in the class of Solomon's writings, Proverbs coming first, Ecclesiastes next, and the Song last. It may be said, Melito does not mention Esther or Nehemiah; but as the Jews appended Lamentations to Jeremiah, they may very naturally have joined Nehemiah to Ezra, and even appended Esther to both. But our business is with the Song. Who can doubt that it was received in the apostles' days, and through all the Christian churches? Let us now examine the bearing of Melito's catalogue on Dr. Smith's two opposite theories.

The first supposes the Jews to have admitted into their canon this Song, before the time of our Lord, by whom it was silently rejected. We find, then, that his silence did not produce the effect Dr. Smith supposes to be intended; nor was it likely to produce any other than the contrary effect. Every reflecting man would naturally have said, "if the Song was in the Jewish canon and was not divine, our Lord would never have referred to their scriptures *in the gross*, without making any exceptions; when he knew that his hearers might apply his high commendations of the scriptures to a book which had no claim to authority so exalted. If we are to exclude

every book about which he was silent, how large a part of the Old Testament must we reject!"

But this is not all. When we say that the Christian church received the Old Testament from the Jewish church, we should remember that this transmission was made under the ministry of Christ and the apostles. Some of the first disciples, who conversed with our Lord, must have known what books he meant by the *scriptures*; at least the apostles must have been informed of this, during "the forty days that he conversed with them on the things concerning the kingdom of God." They, who had been Jews, formed the first churches of converted Jews, with whom this was the first of all questions, "what said those scriptures that were delivered to our fathers, concerning the Messiah, Jesus, and the new dispensation we have embraced?" With this was essentially connected the question, what are those scriptures? To suppose that the apostles either knew not, or knowing, did not clearly inform the churches what were the inspired writings, is scarcely possible. Paul spoke to the Corinthians, of the Old Testament, as if they knew what it contained; and Melito, who lived in the age next to John, tells us it contained just so many books, and one of these was the Song. If the earliest Christians read the scriptures at all in their public worship, of which there is no reason to doubt, they must have read the Old Testament before the New was written. This must have given occasion for deciding the question, what were those scriptures? The language of the apostles on this subject, may be called not only comprehensive, but sweeping, and we can discover no hint of a wish to make exceptions. "From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures. All scripture is given by inspiration, &c. No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." From the country where the apostles founded the churches, in the manner we have described, Melito brought back a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, containing the Song, and which is pronounced by Eusebius an inventory of the universally acknowledged books of the Old Testament. He that cannot be satisfied with this testimony to the canon of the Old Testament, and the canonicity of the Song, must be quite at sea with regard to many of the books of scripture.

Let us advert again to Dr. Smith's second hypothesis; that the Song was not in the Jewish canon in the apostles' days, but was inserted by the Jews in the age of their worst darkness and enmity to Christians, towards the middle of the third century. We have seen, from Melito, that the Christians had received it, at least so early as the middle of the second century, which the Jews could not but have known; for Dr. Smith supposes that the separation between the two did not become complete till the time of Hadrian. He, therefore, chooses the period of the greatest alienation, for the most remarkable imitation. When the Jews most hated the Christians, the former placed in their canon a book which they had hitherto rejected, but which the Christians had, for a hundred years, adopted; as if, in their enmity to the Christians, the zealots for Moses would proclaim to the world, that the followers of Jesus knew better what were the

inspired writings than the peculiar nation to whom they were committed as the oracles of God! This is Dr. Smith's way of accounting for the Song being found in the Old Testament, and so being now received among us, if I understand him aright.

There is yet another point to be noticed. This Melito is said by Polycrates to have been *εὐσεβής*,* alluding to Matt. xix. 12. It has been disputed whether this was meant to be taken literally and physically, or whether it merely expresses, by a strong figure, that, for the sake of the gospel and his ministry, Melito not only maintained a severe chastity, but abstained from lawful marriage. The zeal of the Christians against the sexual impurity of the heathens, was at that time giving rise to those ideas which produced the monks and nuns, and the celibacy of the priests of subsequent ages. Melito was, then, not the man likely to receive Solomon's Song, except under the pressure of overwhelming evidence, and the conviction that it was "a song of loves" divine. As the ascetic notions became more dominant, and Eusebius still owned the book to be among those universally confessed, the same evidence must have triumphed. We have remarks from the early fathers to show that the rejection of the book by some had awakened controversy, but was deemed a heresy, even when celibacy was thought to be most meritorious, especially among ministers.

(To be concluded in our next.)

REMINISCENCES OF AMERICA.

In the spring of 1836 the writer had occasion to visit the United States of America, and many circumstances having conspired to bring him in contact with leading individuals connected with the different denominations of professing Christians in that land, it is his intention, in a series of papers, to communicate the result of his observations, or rather the recollection of the impressions made upon his mind by many of the institutions of that country. He does not intend making these papers a record of the personal favours he received, kindnesses which he hopes he never shall forget, and knows he never can repay. Neither has he any intention of introducing, even occasionally, notices of the little incidents with which every traveller must meet, whatever land he visits. He purposes confining himself to those subjects upon which he has found, in a subsequent tour through Great Britain, that information is chiefly desired by those who are there engaged in carrying on the numerous schemes of benevolence and usefulness.

NO. I.—THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS.

Within a few days after my arrival at New York, the friend, whose guest I was, was called to attend officially the examination of the Theological Seminary at Princetown, New Jersey. I could not have desired a better opportunity of forming an opinion on the state of theological learning in America, and accepted with delight

* Euseb. Ec. Hist. bk. v. ch. 24.

his invitation to accompany him. Three days were devoted to the examination of the students, each professor examining the whole of the classes on the subject of his prelections during the preceding session. The examination was conducted in the presence of a president and assistant examiners, who, however, very seldom availed themselves of their privilege of cross-examining the students, nor was this called for, so thoroughly did the professors go into the several subjects brought under examination. The careless and unbecoming postures of several of the students would, I believe, be tolerated no where, excepting in America; but though acquainted with the course and mode of instruction pursued in several similar institutions in Great Britain, I do not know one that could produce a whole class of students capable of undergoing such an examination as these were subjected to. I satisfied myself that there was nothing like combination betwixt professor and student, or amongst the students themselves, to produce an effect, and that there was no possibility of a student ascertaining beforehand, with any degree of probability, what questions were to be proposed to him, or even on what particular subject he was likely to be examined.

The Professors, who all reside in the village, are the Rev. Archibald Alexander, D.D., known in England as the author of a small Treatise upon the Evidences of Christianity, Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology; the Rev. Samuel Millar, D.D., author of a Treatise on Presbytery, &c. Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government; the Rev. Charles Hodge, D.D., author of a Commentary on the Romans, Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature; the Rev. John Breckenridge, brother to the Rev. Dr. B., who lately visited England, Professor of Pastoral Theology; and J. Addison Alexander, A.M., son of the Rev. Dr. Alexander, Associate Instructor in the Department of Oriental and Biblical Literature. There was evidently much greater freedom of intercourse betwixt professor and student than I have ever witnessed at home; but it was no less evident that the pupil esteemed and respected his instructor. The following is a summary of studies pursued at Princetown, which is at present the first Presbyterian Theological Seminary in the United States:

First Year.—Hebrew Language, Exegetical Study of the Scriptures, Biblical Criticism, Biblical Antiquities, Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures, Mental and Moral Science, The Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, Sacred Chronology, Biblical History.

Second Year.—Exegetical Study of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures continued, Didactic Theology, Ecclesiastical History.

Third Year.—Exegetical Study of Scriptures continued, Polemic Theology, Church Government, Pastoral Theology, Composition and Delivery of Sermons.

Members of the first class are required to exhibit original compositions once in two weeks; those of the second class, once in three weeks; and those of the third class, once in four weeks.

Every person applying for admission into the seminary, must produce satisfactory written testimonials that he possesses good natural

talents, and is of a prudent and discreet deportment; that he is in full communion with some regular church; and that he has passed through a regular course of academic study; or wanting this, he must submit himself to an examination in regard to the branches of literature usually taught in such a course.

When a student has been received under the care of a presbytery, and has passed his examination on the studies usually pursued in colleges with approbation, a certificate from the presbytery, declaring this fact, is received as sufficient to answer every requisition in regard to testimonials. When a student, who has been connected with any other theological seminary, seeks admission into this, he must produce testimonials of his good standing, and regular dismissal, before he can be received.

The proper time for entering the seminary is at the commencement of the winter session, which begins early in November. It is important that students should be present at the opening of the session, in order to make choice of rooms.

The students, in addition to the use of libraries attached to the seminary, have access to that of the College, and on application to the several professors of that Institution, can have the privilege of attending lectures on Anatomy, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, and Natural History.

Gentlemen well qualified to teach the German and French languages are resident there, and give instruction in those branches to such students as desire it at their own expense. There is no charge made either for tuition or room-rent; but each student pays 10 dollars per annum to the General Expense Fund, the object of which is to defray the contingent expenses of the Institution.

Indigent students are aided either by the General Assembly's Board of Education, the Presbyterian Education Society, or the funds of the seminary.

The expense of board in the commons varies from 1 dollar twelve and a half cents to 1 dollar 25 cents per week. Board may be obtained in private families, at from 1 dollar 50 cents to 2 dollars per week. Expense for fuel from 5 dollars to 7 dollars per year. Washing 8 dollars.

Vacations.—There are two vacations in the year, of six weeks each, one commencing on the first Thursday in May, the other on the last Wednesday in September, and a recess of two weeks in February.

It is by no means uncommon for students to spend the last year of their course at some other seminary than that at which they commenced their theological studies. The advantages gained thereby are considerable, and this course is frequently pursued by the students attending the seminaries at Princetown and Andover. The latter, which I had afterwards an opportunity of visiting, is situated in a beautiful village near Boston, Massachusetts, and is the first theological seminary supported by the evangelical Congregationalists of America. Here the Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., is Professor of Christian Theology; the Rev. Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature; and the Rev. Ralph Emerson, Professor of Ecclesiastical

tical History, and Lecturer on Pastoral Duties. The chair of Sacred Rhetoric was then, and I believe still is, vacant. The terms of admission to Andover Theological Seminary are most liberal.

The Institution is open to Protestants of every denomination.

The laws require that every candidate for admission into the seminary shall, previously to his examination, produce to the faculty satisfactory testimonials, from persons of information and respectability, and reputed piety, that he possesses good natural and acquired talents; that he has been regularly educated at some respectable college or university, or has otherwise made literary acquisitions which, as preparatory to theological studies, are substantially equivalent to a liberal education; and that he sustains a fair moral character, is of a prudent and discreet deportment, and is hopefully possessed of personal piety. He must also exhibit to the faculty proper testimonials of his being in full communion with some church of Christ, in default of which he shall subscribe a declaration of his belief in the christian religion. Every candidate thus introduced is to be examined by the faculty with reference to his personal piety, his object in pursuing theological studies, and his knowledge of the learned languages. In cases where the candidate has not been regularly educated at a college, he must also be prepared to sustain an examination in mathematics, logic, rhetoric, philosophy, astronomy, and intellectual philosophy.

To those whose pecuniary necessities require it, about half the price of board, in commons, has been allowed from the charity fund of the seminary. Whether this allowance shall be larger or smaller hereafter, will depend on the price of provisions, and on the number who may apply for aid. No student is charged for instruction; no one living in the public buildings is charged for room or furniture, except that, to keep the furniture and buildings in repair, occupants of the rooms in Bartlet Hall pay four dollars a year, and in Phillip's Hall, two dollars. From the foregoing statement it appears that the privileges of the seminary are, to a large extent, gratuitous to all its members; so that what would be the expenses of a student here, were he to pay regular charges for his education, are greatly diminished by charitable provisions of the seminary, without his being placed on any particular charity foundation.

On this principle, distinguishing the seminary from common colleges, the founders made it a condition of enjoying its privileges, that all its members shall go through a three years course of theological study, unless prevented by some unforeseen and unavoidable necessity; it being their purpose to give a thorough, not a partial education. On the same account, the voluntary failure of any student to comply with the above condition, will be regarded as a violation of his own engagement; and if he has been placed on any foundation, will subject him to the payment of what he has received as a charity student.

Resident licentiates, in addition to those who are elected to the Abbot foundation, may, with leave of the faculty, have access to the library, to the instructions of the officers, and to other exercises of the institution. But it is required that candidates for the enjoyment

of these privileges shall have honourably completed a three years course of professional study at a regular theological seminary, or otherwise have studied theology under good advantages, for at least the same period.

In special cases, however, persons of reputed piety and promising talents and acquirements, who have not passed through a regular course of theological study, and have the ministry or missionary service in view, may be permitted by the faculty, with the approbation of the committee of exigencies, to enjoy the above-named privileges of resident licentiates.

It will be seen that at both seminaries the student has it in his choice to live within the walls of the institution, or to lodge with a private family. The former has, I believe, few recommendations beyond the great saving of expense thereby effected. The majority of students, however, at theological seminaries, and also at colleges and universities, avail themselves of the provision made by the institutions for their accommodation. I observed that much greater quietness is preserved than at some of the English colleges where this plan is adopted. At some of the universities and colleges, where the students are younger, the tutors, a class of instructors whose office is inferior to that of the professor, have apartments on the same floor with the students, and their presence checks any noise; but in the seminaries or theological institutions this is found unnecessary. This mode of living approximates much more to the custom so prevalent in America, of living at boarding-houses, &c. than to the domestic habits of the English; so that the students feel less temptation to break out into boisterous mirth, or intrude into each other's apartments, than those who are similarly situated in England; and most of the professors seemed to prefer the students living together within the walls of the institution. The appointment of the individual who furnishes the refectory lies with the Trustees, I believe, who also fix the rate of charges. He has a few perquisites, such as free house, kitchen-garden, &c., but is supported by the profit he can make on the articles consumed; at the same time he finds it his interest to provide as good a table as possible for the money; for, if dissatisfied, the students will leave him, and go to board in private families. He has, in general, nothing to do with the sleeping apartments of the students, or other arrangements of the house.

A change of public sentiment respecting the advantages of these remains of monastic establishments, I thought I could observe commencing in New York, whence it is likely to spread throughout the States.

Very great advantages are found to result from the whole term (with the exception of two short annual vacations) being devoted to study; and the principal objection made to such an arrangement, viz. that many students cannot support themselves during so long a course of preparation, is met by several provisions made for the assistance of such young men. There are *foundations* similar to the *bursaries* at the Scotch universities. One Education Society, liberally supported, offers assistance to all who are found deserving of such aid.

The s
to rep
upon
and
to su
appo
soci
men
debt
mor
thir
frie
two
req
tag
is p
fun
me
bor
he
it;
ha
vis
tic
at
lin

pr
ro
ce

w
s
s
a
t

The student is supplied with money upon loan, which he is expected to repay as soon after his ordination as possible. No interest is charged upon it till two years after his ordination over a settled congregation; and as missionaries are supposed to receive no more than is sufficient to supply their necessary wants, on a student's accepting a missionary appointment, either to a home or foreign station, his debt to the society is from that day considered cancelled. Lest the young men should form expensive habits, and overburden themselves with debt while yet students, the Society will not supply any one with more than is sufficient to defray a portion, if I recollect aright, two-thirds of his necessary expenditure. If neither his parents nor his friends can supply him with the other third, by working during the two vacations he may, without much difficulty, save as much as is required. The plan appeared to me to be fraught with many advantages. The money only being supplied on loan, no inducement is presented to any to apply but those for whose accommodation the funds are provided. The young man is trained from the commencement of his studies at college to habits of economy, since, the less he borrows, he has the less afterwards to repay. Being once approved, he knows that the money is ready, and that he has only to apply for it; he is thereby preserved from those harassing anxieties which have broken the spirit of many a hopeful youth, and a plentiful provision of food being made at a very low rate, he is under no temptation to practise those abstemious habits which in other lands have, at the commencement of their course, destroyed the constitution, and limited the usefulness of many candidates for the pastoral office.

A feeling of independence is moreover preserved, which enables the pastor, through life, to take much higher ground in administering reproof or advice to the flock committed to his charge, than he could otherwise do.

There are, however, several clergymen and laymen, connected with the Presbyterian church, who take a different view of the subject, and considering that the incubus of a debt upon a newly-settled minister must be distressing in its influence, have organized another Education Society, which makes an unconditional grant to the students supported by it; the student may, of course, afterwards refund what the Society has laid out on his education if so disposed, but this he is neither asked nor expected to do. Though not so extensive in its operations as the former, still it is an important Society.

A system of manual labour was introduced some years ago into a few colleges, &c., in America. At some of these institutions it was expected that by working a few hours a day at some handicraft, the wages of the student would support him while pursuing his studies. Exercise would at the same time be taken, and habits formed and skill acquired which might afterwards be useful to him. Of this system there were two or three modifications, but the opinion of most with whom I had conversation on the subject was, that however plausible in theory, it had failed in practice. Extensive gardens and workshops, supplied with carpenters' tools, &c., are attached to

most of the seminaries and colleges, and the students *may* work but except at one or two are not required to do so.

The christian public of America is evidently alive to the importance of having an educated ministry, and a proportional effort is made to secure it. In that country the defenders of truth and error meet on terms of equality, and must fight with the same weapons; the only advantage enjoyed by the former being that necessarily resulting from the circumstance that it is truth he is called upon to defend.

Notwithstanding the very great demand there is for ministers in America, the trustees of neither of the seminaries already spoken of will consent to the ordination of a young man until he has either completed his seven years' course of study, including four years spent at college, or has undergone satisfactorily such an examination as would have been required of him at the conclusion of his course of study. By short vacations the evils almost necessarily connected with the course pursued in Scotland are avoided; by withholding permission to preach until certain attainments have been made, the attention of the students is not diverted from their studies, nor their time frittered away by preaching appointments, as are the frequent consequences of the system adopted by the Congregationalists and Baptists in England, and the advantages are apparent. Their preaching talents are, in my opinion, warped as that opinion may be supposed to be in favour of the British pulpit, much inferior to those of the English; but I believe very few, if any, of the English ministers, who have enjoyed no advantages in education excepting such as are afforded by the English seminaries, could long sustain the constant drain upon an American minister's resources. And a Scotch student, fresh from the Divinity Hall, would, I imagine, experience considerable difficulty in accommodating himself to the diversified calls upon a minister's time, and be able to go through the pulpit preparations he would find necessary for the numerous engagements of an American pastor.

In conducting their classes, the professors generally adopt the plan of conversational examinations, which at once affords them an opportunity of ascertaining the attainments of the student and training him to think for himself, accustoming him to avail himself of his own resources, and to apply all his previous acquisitions. Such conversational examinations sometimes change into extemporaneous disquisitions upon subjects incidentally introduced, and the student may at any time request the professor to furnish him with his reasons for holding the sentiments advanced, or mention any thing which appears to him irreconcilable with the doctrines propounded from the chair. Such interruptions appear to be encouraged rather than checked; and even if the observation of the student were foolish or impertinent, it would be replied to meekly, but in such a way, probably, that the young man would not soon venture again to measure swords with his instructor.

St. Petersburg.

J. C. B.

THE PORTFOLIO OF AUTOGRAPHS.

UNDER this title the Editor intends to present his readers with a collection of letters that is in his possession, written by eminent individuals in the church of Christ, which, he trusts, will be found both interesting and useful. He will thank any of his correspondents or readers who are in possession of autograph unpublished letters, suited for these pages, to favour him with authentic copies of them, by which he hopes to increase the interest and variety of this Portfolio.

I. REV. AUGUSTUS MONTAGUE TOPLADY, B.A. Vicar of Broad Hembury, Devon, and Lecturer at Orange Street Chapel, London. Born 1737; died 1778.

*To Mr. William Tucker, Chard, containing editorial advice and acknowledgments.**

Dear Sir,—I had the pleasure, and a very great pleasure it was, of receiving your late favour from Chard, which should have been much earlier acknowledged, but for a tour through the north-east counties, from whence I returned to London but last night. This evening or to-morrow I design to set off for South Wales on a short visit to dear Lady Huntingdon, after which I intend to see Broad Hembury for ten days or a fortnight. "The Gospel Magazine," concerning which you write, has been under my sole management from last January inclusive. The present month of August, indeed, I have devolved on my good friend, Mr. Ryland, of Northampton, that I might be at liberty to make my rural excursions without impediment. Rest assured, dear Sir, that while I have the conducting of that publication, we shall be happy to have it honoured and enriched by your valuable correspondence.

Permit me, however, to hint, that the shorter the respective pieces can be made, the more acceptable they will prove to the generality of readers, because, in that case, we can relieve their attention by a greater variety of materials, and of late our correspondents are grown so numerous, that I am often at an absolute loss which to insert. Consequently, the more concise their respective favours are, the more room there is for including the many excellent pieces which are continually sent. I am sometimes forced

* Mr. Tucker was a member of the Baptist church in Chard. He contributed to the Gospel Magazine several letters on the subject of Predestination, which, however, some occurrences in Providence prevented him from completing. Twenty years afterwards, at the solicitations of his friends, he finished his series, and published them in a duodecimo volume, entitled, "Predestination calmly considered, from Principles of Reason, in consistency with the Nature of things and the Scriptures of Truth; in a Series of Letters to a Friend. To which is added, Answers to Seven Queries on Predestination. By W. Tucker." 1798.

to condense many of them into a narrower compass, else I should be under the disagreeable necessity of entirely omitting them.

I am very happy, dear Sir, to find that the good Spirit of our God has directed your thoughts so greatly and so deeply to the grand article of predestination, the denial of which is neither more nor less than absolute and essential atheism. No grace, no happiness, no holiness, no salvation without it. The Lord enable us to extract more and more honey from this precious rock, and may its heavenly streams replenish, enrich, fertilize, and adorn our conversation with increasing redundancy to the perfect day! Free-will, left to itself, cannot fail of leading its wretched possessors to hell. Free grace alone can bring lost sinners to heaven. I am, dear Sir, with earnest prayers for your present and eternal welfare, your affectionate friend and humble servant in Christ Jesus.

AUGUSTUS TOPLADY.

No. 5, New Street, Covent Garden,
August 20th, 1776.

My kind salutations wait on our valuable friend, Mr. Pitts. You'll please to direct your future favours for the Magazine to Messrs. Vallance and Simmons, No. 120, Cheapside, London.

II. Rev. JOHN WESLEY, M. A. Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford.
Founder of the Wesleyan Methodist connection. Born 1703;
died 1791.

*To Miss Ball, at Mr. Ball's, Laceman, in High Wycombe,
Bucks, containing religious advice.*

Haverford West, August 12th, 1769.

My dear Sister,—It is true in general, that pleasing temptations are more dangerous than painful ones. We arm ourselves, and stand upon our guard against pain, but melt away at the approach of pleasure. Yet, while you watch and pray, you shall conquer both: you will be enabled

To trace his example, the world to disdain,
And constantly trample on pleasure and pain.

The more time you can spend in private prayer, and in visiting the sick and the well, the better. But you will have need of great watchfulness herein likewise, or you will slide into unprofitable conversation, and this would disappoint your whole design. In the minutes of the last Conference at London, there is an excellent method of visiting proposed. You may borrow those minutes from Mr. Rhodes, and they will lead you step by step. Peace be with your spirit.

I am, my dear Sister,
Your affectionate Brother,
J. WESLEY.

R E V I E W.

Divine Inspiration ; or the Supernatural Influence exerted in the Communication of Divine Truth ; and its special Bearing on the Composition of the Sacred Scriptures. With Notes and Illustrations. By the Rev. E. Henderson, Doctor in Philosophy. London . Jackson and Walford. 8vo. pp. 574.

It gives us no slight concern that, from various causes, our notice of this volume has been so long delayed. Many of our ministerial brethren have doubtless seen and read it. We cannot, however, do justice to our convictions without urging it upon the attention of the christian public generally, and of our own denomination especially, as a work which does honour, not merely to the religious body to which its author belongs, but to the age in which we live. Not long ago we had occasion to invite the patronage of our denomination of works which are the result of learning and patient thought, but which require, in order to a profitable perusal, more time and attention than many amongst us seem disposed to give to them. We repeat the request which was then made. We have the strongest conviction, that in no department of duty are the wealthy members to our denomination more deficient than in the encouragement they give to volumes similar to the one before us, and which, though they cannot, from their nature, become popular, and thus secure an extensive, or any thing approaching to a remunerating sale, are likely to influence and form the theological opinions of the present and succeeding race of ministers, and, through them, to operate most powerfully upon the spiritual condition of the church through many generations yet unborn. We would respectfully suggest to those amongst us to whom God has given property, and who are bound to devote it in the most efficient manner to the cause of Christ, whether, in the patronage and extensive diffusion of such works as those to which we have referred, they may not open to themselves almost a new channel of doing good on the most extensive scale.

Dr. Henderson has, we think, conferred a great obligation upon the church of God, and especially upon his own denomination, in the publication of this volume on Inspiration. The known learning of its author—not surpassed, we believe, in any of the far-famed Episcopal colleges of our land—his powers of patient research, and his general talent, had awakened high expectations in regard to the volume, which the work itself will not disappoint. We tender to him our best thanks for the information and profit, as well as

pleasure, which we have derived from it. Without pledging ourselves to an approbation of all its statements, we have the happiness to agree with most of its important principles; we accordingly give it our warmest recommendation, and wish that its circulation may bear some proportion to its undoubted excellence.

Dr. Henderson uses the term inspiration in a wider sense than that which is ordinarily attached to it, as comprehending not merely "the particular species of divine influence which was enjoyed by the sacred penman, but the entire subject of revelation, or the various modes in which Jehovah employed supernatural agency for the purpose of disclosing his will." Employing the word in this generic and extended sense, the Doctor is naturally led to give a full account of the various modes in which divine REVELATION has been communicated; and, in the treatment of this branch of the subject, his peculiar qualifications for the task assigned to him, especially his extensive and varied learning, become fully apparent. We believe that, on this point, as well as in his statement of the meaning of those terms and phrases which have been selected to express the Spirit's influence upon the mind; and in his historical sketch of the "*dogma*" (we greatly dislike the word) "of inspiration," the reader will gather more full and exact information than he can obtain from any other book in any language whatever. We have generally agreed with Dr. H. in the opinions expressed in the first three or four Lectures; but we cannot afford space for quotations from this part of the volume, as our object is to put our readers more fully in possession of our author's sentiments in reference to inspiration in the more limited acceptance of the term.

We are, we confess, somewhat disposed to regret that Dr. Henderson has thought it expedient to treat of inspiration in this wide and generic sense. We have felt that, if the volume had been restricted to the consideration of that influence which was intended to secure to the church a perfect statement of all that infinite wisdom saw fit to communicate to the world, its practical value would have been perhaps greater than it is likely to be at present. That, when the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments proceeded from the pens of the respective writers, they were so guided by the Holy Spirit as to lay a solid basis for our confidence that we have, in those scriptures, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is a point of such infinite importance, that it is to be wished, perhaps, that our attention had not been distracted by the introduction of so many even of collateral subjects, interspersed as they are by a number of minor disquisitions of no great importance, and which break the continuity of the work. We have felt also, that, as a distinction must be made between that influence which conveys the knowledge of truths and facts to the mind, and that which secures a perfect statement of those truths and facts for the permanent benefit of the church, Dr. H., employing the term inspiration in this double sense, incurs the danger, when he proceeds to establish the fact of inspiration, of using arguments which sometimes apply to one, and sometimes to the other, of these senses. We will only illustrate our meaning by a reference to the argument contained in

page 261, in support of inspiration in the restricted sense of the term. It is built upon the supernatural character of the doctrines and precepts of Christianity. Now this argument is valid and powerful in support of *revelation*, but is it equally so in support of *inspiration*? It proves, beyond all controversy, that the exalted views of God, &c., which are developed, must have been obtained from God, but does it equally prove that, in the communication to us of a knowledge derived from a supernatural source, the writers were under supernatural influence? We apprehend not. Other arguments doubtless prove it, but not this.

We entirely approve of our author's definition of inspiration in its application to the sacred writers, viz., that it was "an extraordinary and supernatural influence exerted by the Holy Spirit on the minds of the sacred writers, in such modes and degrees as to lead to, and secure, in documentary forms, the deposition of such historical, didactic, devotional, and prophetic truth, as infinite wisdom deemed requisite for the immediate and future benefit of mankind," pp. 353, 354; yet there seems to us a transgression of logical order in suspending this definition till the proof of the fact has been stated. According to Dr. Henderson's order, sundry weighty reasons are adduced in support of something of which the book leaves us in present ignorance; and the veil is only taken from the proposition to be believed, when the reasons for its reception have been adduced.

The proofs of the inspiration of the scriptures are divided into the presumptive and the positive. The first of the *à priori* arguments adduced is the reason of the case. If God has been pleased to make a revelation of his will, it must have been in such a way as to secure the great ends of its impartation. The second argument is derived from the incongruity of supposing that such writings as the scriptures could have proceeded from the pens of those to whom they are ascribed, except they had been the subjects of supernatural influence. We are not convinced, for reasons already stated, of the conclusiveness of this argument, in support of the specific point it is brought forwards to sustain. We admit fully, indeed, that the nature of some of the subjects treated of in the scriptures proves that the knowledge of them could not have originated in the operations of the writer's intellect; that it must have been derived from inspiration in the generic sense of the term; but Dr. Henderson has now entered upon the proof of inspiration in the limited and specific sense; and, in support of this, we suspect its validity. It is surely a conceivable case that supernatural influence should communicate knowledge above the unassisted reach of the human mind, while, in the impartation of that knowledge to others, the subject of it was left to the unaided exertions of his own powers. The third argument of this class is furnished by the miracles wrought by Moses or the apostles, who either wrote the scriptures, or gave their sanction to them as divine. In reference to this argument our opinion differs, in some measure, from that of the author: at all events, we attach more importance to the argument than he appears to do.

By placing it among the presumptive arguments, whose province is not, he says, "to impart a perfect conviction of the truth of inspiration," and by resting the positive proof of the same in both Testaments upon the attestation of Christ thereto, he would seem necessarily to imply that the miracles of Moses and of the apostles do not of themselves supply a basis sufficiently stable to support our confidence, that they wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of God. And yet, in treating upon the argument from miracles, he founds the obligation of the Israelites to receive the doctrines of Moses upon the displays he had given of miraculous power; and he adds, very justly, we think, though somewhat at variance with his subsequent statements: "Nor was this obligation restricted to any particular mode of delivery. It was their duty to attend to his written instructions, just as much as it was to attend to the verbal messages which he delivered from the mouth of God."—p. 267.

We are not quite sure, after all, whether we differ from Dr. Henderson here, but we are disposed to maintain the position, that the inspiration both of Moses and of the apostles has, and must have, for its ultimate basis, the evidence of miracles. There can be no doubt, indeed, that admitting the divine mission of Christ, and consequently the truth of his testimony, the shortest and most direct proof that Moses and the apostles wrote by inspiration of God, is the express or implied testimony of Christ that such was the fact; but the question occurs here, and let not the reader be startled by its apparent impiety—"Why are we to receive that testimony?" We believe the only answer is, "because his miracles are the seal of heaven, not merely to the divinity of his mission, but to the truth of what he makes known in the discharge of it, (if, indeed, these are to be regarded as different things;) since the God of truth would never thus accredit an individual who delivered false testimony in his name." Our Lord's testimony sustains the inspiration of both Testaments; but his miracles sustain the truth of his testimony, and therefore inspiration ultimately bases itself upon the evidence of miracles. It has not been customary to maintain that the doctrine of inspiration is to be received simply on the declarations of those by whom the scriptures were written, without any regard to the important questions, who and what were the men who make such declarations as Dr. Henderson seems to intimate; but we assume them to be infallible in uttering those declarations, and we have a right to make the assumption, because they either possessed miraculous power themselves, or their writings were attested by those who did possess it, and, believing them to be infallible, we believe them also to be inspired. We cannot go at any further length into the argument, but beg the reader's attention to the following remark. We should not believe a man to be inspired merely because he said so; but if a man, accredited by the possession of miraculous power, made the same affirmation, we ought to believe him. We should be bound to receive his message as true, to believe that God would preserve him

from
latte
tion.
W
Lec
ture
ada
rea
I
the
infl
and
of
du
an
rec

he
a
co
th
th
w
of
p
e
h
t
p
C
p

from all error in stating it, whether orally, or by writing; i. e. if the latter were the case, we should be bound to believe in his inspiration.

We could quote largely, and with great pleasure, from the 6th Lecture, in which the positive proofs of the inspiration of the scriptures are detailed at length. The whole appears to us excellent, and adapted to lay an ample and solid foundation for the faith of the reader in this fundamental truth.

In the 7th Lecture the Doctor enters upon the consideration of the important and difficult questions, "what was the nature of that influence which was exerted on the minds of the sacred writers? and how did it operate to the production of that unerring standard of truth, which their writings comprise?" The inquiry is conducted with great judgment and caution, and the opinion expressed, and, we think, fully established by our author, will be seen on reading the following passage:

"If the admired position be indeed just, that, when God makes the prophet, he does not unmake the man, it may rationally be concluded, that, in exerting a supernatural influence upon the powers of the human mind, he did not act contrary to the nature of the functions which he has allotted to them; but, on the contrary, operated upon them precisely as they are ordinarily operated upon—the only difference consisting in the super-addition of mental vigour, which it was not in the power of inferior agency to supply, and the infallible certainty of the sequences resulting from his immediate operations. In bringing those powers into action, the influence exerted would be such as, in each particular case, was necessary to secure the proposed end. Sometimes one faculty would be called into exercise; sometimes another; but each, or more of them combined, as the exigency of the occasion required. In arresting the attention; presenting objects of sensation and perception; creating and guiding processes of ratiocination; suggesting new elements and combinations of thought; prompting to investigation; producing elevation of feeling; reviving former impressions and associations; or preserving from fallacy and error—there is reason to believe, that the Holy Spirit conducted his administration so as not to do violence to any of the natural faculties with which he had endowed the agents whom he condescended to employ. They were his instruments, but not blind or unconscious mechanical instruments of his will. They continued to be the subjects of perception, memory, imagination, judgment, and will, all of which he sanctified for the execution of the important task to which he called them.

"Such a view of the subject is completely borne out by the facts of the case, as presented on almost every page of the Bible. Instead of appearing there in the character of mere passive agents, the writers display evident marks of conscious and rational activity. They relate facts, teach doctrines, inculcate duties, lay down premises, draw conclusions, reflect, remember, resolve, hope, fear, rejoice, grieve, &c., so far as the natural constitution of the mind is concerned, in a way precisely analogous to what they would have done, had no supernatural influence been exerted. In fact, to such an extent does the active agency of the instruments pervade the composition, and so manifestly does it appear, that when adverting to any particular passage, nothing is more common than for writers of opposite views of the subject to employ the language: 'according to the reasoning of the apostle;' 'Paul says;' 'it is affirmed by John,' &c.—language, which would be altogether destitute of meaning, if the ordinary exercise of their faculties had been counteracted or suspended while the process of inspiration was being carried on by the higher Agent, in whose service they were engaged. Nor is it unusual for the New Testament writers themselves to speak in the same style: 'Even as David also describeth the

blessedness of the man : ' Moses saith : ' Paul hath written—as also in all his Epistles, speaking of these things.' ”—pp. 344—346.

Dr. Henderson denies that every thing contained in scripture was immediately revealed to the writers at the moment of its composition. He asks, very justly, “How are we to conceive of an immediate impartation of that which they already possessed?” (How could that be put into the mind which was already in it?) “Was it necessary,” he continues, “for example, that Moses should have communicated to him the knowledge of the circumstance, that ‘the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon dry ground, and that the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left?’ (Exod. xiv. 22.) Or Matthew, that ‘as Jesus passed from Nazareth, he saw a man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom?’ (Matt. ix. 9.) Or Paul, that ‘Achaia was ready a year ago’ with her contributions, and that the zeal of the believers had provoked very many? (2 Cor. ix. 2.) These were circumstances which they could not but know, and therefore, they required no inspiration to make them acquainted with them. Innumerable instances of a similar description might be adduced; and indeed the fact is so notorious, that it is only necessary to mention it, in order at once to produce a vivid impression of its bearing on the present discussion.”—p. 352. “The great end,” he afterwards adds, “for which the extraordinary supernatural influence in question was exerted, was to provide mankind with a depository of divine truth, out of which all that variety of instruction might be derived, which should be adapted by the diversified exigencies of the human condition and character, and to which, as to its infallible standard, an ultimate appeal might be made in all matters of conscience towards God and man. In producing such a collection, it was not necessary to exert the influence always precisely in the same way,” &c. There was a diversity of operation; but were it intended, by asserting this, to insinuate that different degrees of authority were given, by inspiration, to the scriptures, “then, undoubtedly,” adds Dr. Henderson, the theory of such diversity “must meet with unqualified reprobation from every one who ‘trembles at the word of the Lord.’ But if it can be proved, that what was written under the influence of the lowest conceivable degree of inspiration possesses the divine sanction equally with that which was written under the most elevated—being the operation of the same Holy Spirit, and intended for the spiritual good of mankind, those who maintain such a distinction cannot justly be charged with lowering the inspiration of the word of God, or, in any way, making it void. They simply view the subject in the lights in which it is placed in the scriptures, and taking them for their guide, they feel assured, that they cannot be in error.”—pp. 363, 364.

These divers operations are stated by Dr. H. to have been divine excitement, invigoration, superintendence, guidance, and direct revelation. We add the concluding statement, and caution :

“From a review, therefore, of all the facts of the case, and from analogy, it appears convincingly evident, that a diversity of degrees or modes of operation

did exist in regard to the extraordinary influence which was vouchsafed to the penmen of sacred scripture; and that this diversity was the result of infinite wisdom, adapting its operations to the existing circumstances of the instruments who were thus employed, and to the nature of the subjects which they were to record. And it appears equally clear, that except we admit such diversity, it is impossible to form correct scriptural ideas of the subject, or to arrive at those conclusions respecting it, which shall prove satisfactory to the inquisitive mind.

“Nor can the distinction, which we have endeavoured to establish, be justly chargeable with an aspect, in the slightest degree, hostile to the divine authority of any part of scripture. There is no portion of that holy book which was written independently on miraculous influence. Those parts, as we have already observed, which were composed under the lowest degree of inspiration, are, in so far as the book itself is concerned, equally inspired with that which resulted from the highest. In either case, and in all the supposable intermediate stages, the end was infallibly attained, viz. the commitment to writing of precisely such matters as God designed for the religious instruction of mankind. The whole volume is divinely inspired. Every part of it is to be received in the light in which it has been presented by the Holy Spirit; and is to be applied to the holy purposes for which he caused it to be written.”—pp. 385, 386.

Lecture VIII. discusses the question of verbal inspiration. The point in dispute is thus stated. Some maintain that the sacred writers “not only had all the ideas immediately communicated to their minds by the Holy Spirit, but that their very style, including every word, syllable, and letter, was equally the result of pure organic inspiration. To deny this, is, in their opinion, to sap the very foundation of the doctrine; to withhold from the scriptures that sacred veneration to which they are entitled; and to reduce them to a level with mere human writings. Others, who as decidedly believe in the complete inspiration of the Bible, and will not concede that any part of it was written independently on the Divine influences, nevertheless hold that the hypothesis of an universal immediate verbal inspiration cannot be sustained; but that a modified view may be taken of the subject, which will reconcile apparently conflicting phenomena, and present it in a light which must recommend it to all persons of calm and impartial minds. To the latter view we frankly confess we are compelled to give our adhesion.”—p. 389.

With this opinion we must fully concur. The arguments by which the Doctor supports it are, in our judgment, for the most part, conclusive. We speak thus, because we doubt whether diversity of style disproves the “dogma” of verbal inspiration. In page 396, our author seeks to involve in contradiction those who admit diversity of style, and contend at the same time for verbal inspiration. It is manifest, however, that the sole contradiction, if any, results from the imperfect manner in which he has stated the case. Conceding—which, however, we do not concede—that each writer was virtually the amanuensis of the Spirit, there is no contradiction in supposing that the thoughts and words dictated to each would be in accordance with his usual and natural manner of expressing himself.

The universality of the immediate inspiration of the words is no where, says Dr. H., asserted in scripture. The contrary, indeed, has been inferred from certain passages which seem to assert verbal

inspiration. Dr. H. enters into a critical examination of them, and he shows most satisfactorily, yea, we think, triumphantly, that "the appeals, which have been made to scripture in defence of this theory, are the result either of a contracted notion of the general subject, or of misapprehension with respect to the force and bearing of those passages in the inspired records which have been pressed into its service. A thorough-going and consistent comparison of 'spiritual things with spiritual' will evince, that it derives no legitimate support from this quarter." We would especially commend to the examination of the reader the whole of what is said on this point, and pre-eminently pp. 406—9.

Amongst other arguments adduced against universal verbal inspiration, Dr. H. refers to the various readings of the original scriptures which exist. We doubt whether the argument here is put in the best possible way. The proper mode of stating it appears to us to be this:—If the Holy Spirit inspired universally the words of the *αὐτόγραφα*, it must be because he deemed it necessary; and, in that case, there would have been no various readings. God would have interposed by miracle to *secure* to the church, as he did to give to it what was necessary. The Doctor, however, reduces the advocates of verbal inspiration to the following inextricable dilemma: "Either the Bible is a sufficient and authoritative rule of faith, though not verbally existing in the condition in which it was published by the writers: or, we have not, and never can expect to possess any such rule."

Dr. Henderson, again, adduces against the notion of verbal inspiration, its tendency to sink the authority of faithful translations. This is evident. If inspiration exists rather in the thoughts than the words, then a version which transfuses the thoughts of the original into another language may be, and is, the word of God; but not otherwise. If the inspiration be in the words, why should not a change of words, which is necessarily involved in translation, deprive the version of all claim to be the word of God as really as a change of thought would do it.

"In the last place," says our author, "we object to the universality of verbal inspiration, because it is flatly contradicted by the facts of the case, as presented by the sacred text itself." The Doctor adduces the discrepancy which is sometimes found to exist in different accounts of the same discourse or fact. He refers to the statements of the decalogue in Exodus and Deuteronomy—to the varying accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper. This argument is put with singular force. We can scarcely forbear quoting pp. 444—8, but we dare not go so far beyond our limits.

We rather regret that Dr. Henderson should have come to a sort of compromise with the verbalists in meeting the argument frequently brought forwards in defence of their theory, viz. that we think in words; if thoughts, therefore, are inspired, words must be so also. "This," says our author, "in a certain sense, may be granted." We will grant it, however, in no sense. It is a metaphysical "dogma," not untrue, but unmeaning. We know what it is to think in a room. We have often thought—albeit, perhaps to

little purpose—in the beloved retreat of every literary man, in our study. We could think, we have no doubt, in a tea-pot, if it were large enough; but to think *in words* is altogether past our comprehension. Our readers will, we hope, pardon our thus laughing at a metaphysical dogma which has too long passed current, but which is an arrant absurdity. Thoughts can in no sense be said to be in words. Words are the symbols or the signs of thought—the means of expressing thought; but the bond of union is between the thoughts, not the words. One thought introduces another, and the thought suggests the word, which is its conventional sign. The assertion that we think *in words* necessarily supposes the contrary—that the word comes first to the mind, and brings the thought along with it.

In the lecture upon the canon the reader will find a large amount of condensed and valuable information. Our limits will not, however, allow us to touch upon more than one point; but that is one of no trifling importance. Our readers have doubtless marked, with deep interest, the pending controversy between two reverend and beloved brethren on the canonical authority of the Song of Solomon. Dr. Henderson thus expresses himself on the turning point of the controversy.

“Have we, or have we not sufficient reason to believe, that it formed part of the Jewish canon in the time of our Saviour and his apostles? If it did, then, as we have already proved, it must indisputably have received their sanction as a divine book, and is, on this high and sacred authority, to be received as such by us, irrespective of the internal difficulties which it may be thought to contain. If it occupied a place in that canon then, it cannot now be rejected with impunity. We are bound to receive it as the word of God, and apply ourselves to the study of it with the simplicity, humility, and prayer, which are indispensable to our attaining to a correct understanding of its import, and our deriving from it the instruction which it was intended to afford. What then, it may be asked, is the amount of testimony adducible in support of its canonicity? That it is in all the Hebrew manuscripts, which profess to contain the entire Scriptures of the Old Testament, is beyond dispute. That it existed in such manuscripts in the days of the Masorites, that is to say, some six or seven hundred years previous to the transcription of the oldest Hebrew manuscripts now extant, is equally incontestible. That it ever was wanting, we have no authority for supposing. It is found in the catalogue exhibited in the Talmud, and in those of Jerome, Rufinus, Origen, and Melito, and was even commented upon by Hippolytus and Origen. It was translated into Greek by Symmachus before the end of the second century; by Theodotion during the first half of the same century; and by Aquila, according to John and other Biblical critics, between the years 90 and 130.”

We must now take our leave of this volume, and of its author. We trust that the life and labours of our gifted and much honoured brother will be long continued, and that the fountain of sanctified talent and learning, which his work has laid open to view, will pour forth many additional streams to make glad the city of God.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

A Course of Thirteen Lectures, to Mechanics and others, delivered at Holycell Mount Chapel, in 1837, by Ministers in connection with the Christian Instruction Society, carefully corrected and revised by the respective Lecturers. 12mo. London. W. Harding, pp. 214. Price 3s.

WE think it highly creditable to the disinterested and laborious zeal of the dissenting Ministers in London, who are connected with the Christian Instruction Society, that during the present winter they have engaged gratuitously in four distinct courses of lectures to young men, mechanics, and others, on subjects calculated to interest the classes to whom they are addressed. These, we understand, have been attended by crowded auditories, and we are happy to hear that this good example is likely to be followed in some of the provincial towns. It appears the present volume owes its existence to the ready pen and enterprising spirit of the publisher, who, having taken down in short-hand the successive lectures, submitted the manuscripts to the respective lecturers for revision, and published them in weekly numbers, until completed, at a very cheap rate. We may, then, suppose these lectures are free from those gross mistakes which have been often complained of in pirated reports of sermons, while they seem a fair specimen of the pulpit style of the respective preachers. The lectures embrace thirteen of the leading facts of Old Testament history, from the creation of man to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and contain an amount of historical and practical information that cannot fail to make this volume useful.

General Introduction to a Course of Lectures on English Grammar and Composition. By Henry Rogers, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University College, London. 18mo. boards, pp. 132. London: W. Ball.

THESE Lectures will occasion, we doubt not, the Senate of University College to congratulate themselves on their happy appointment of Mr. Rogers to a professor's chair in that institution.

The first lecture is occupied in asserting the utility of studying grammar and rhetoric, in opposition to some opinions expressed in a recent article on Lord Bacon, in the *Edinburgh Review*; and the second is occupied with an outline of Mr. Rogers's proposed course, stating the general principles on which it will be conducted.

Both lectures are replete with valuable and original remarks, which cannot fail to be interesting and instructive to every intelligent reader. We therefore cordially recommend this book to the notice of the students of our theological seminaries, and to young persons studying the English language in superior schools, as a manual which cannot fail to promote the correctness and purity of their styles and compositions.

What is Truth? The Question answered, in Eight Discourses, delivered at St. James's Chapel, Mary-le-bone, by the Rev. T. White, A.M. 12mo. Burns, Portman Square.

SHORT, plain, and pious discourses, in defence of Christianity against Infidelity; of Orthodoxy against Heresy; and of Protestantism against Popery. Indirectly, too, they defend Church-of-Englandism against Dissent, in all its grades and forms; and Millenarianism against the views of the opposers of the personal reign.

The author does not affect to be infallible, hence he will give us leave to doubt respecting the soundness of some of his opinions and arguments on the

multifarious topics introduced into his discourses; while, at the same time, we feel no hesitation in recommending his work to the attention of such of our readers as may feel interested in the subjects it embraces.

THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

Essays and Correspondence, chiefly on Scriptural Subjects. By the late John Walker, some time a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and a Clergyman in the Establishment. Collected and prepared for the press by William Burton. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Longman and Co.

Answer to Mr. Robert Haldane's Strictures on the Translation of Dr. Tholuck's Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. Robert Menzies, the translator. 8vo. Edinburgh: T. Clarke. London: Hamilton and Co.

A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. By Edward Robinson, D.D., late Professor in the Theological Seminary, Andover. A new and improved edition, revised by Alexander Negris and the Rev. John Duncan, A.M. Glasgow. large 8vo. Edinburgh: T. Clark.

Hints on the Study of Biblical Criticism in Scotland. By W. M. Gunn, of the Edinburgh Southern Academy. 8vo. Edinburgh: T. Clark. London: Hamilton and Co.

The History of the Bastille, and of its principal Captives. By R. A. Davenport. 12mo. being Vol. LXIV, of the Family Library. London: Tegg and Son.

The illustrated Family Bible, with copious Marginal References, Notes, and Annotations; and a complete Concordance to the Old and New Testament. Part I. Folschap folio. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

An Apology for Religious Freedom. By Piers Edmunds Butler, B.A. lately Curate of St. Margaret's, Ipswich. 8vo. London: Ward and Co.

Select Sermons. By the Right Reverend William Berridge, D.D., Bishop of St. Asaph. 12mo. Tract Society.

Twelve Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion, delivered in Rome. By Nicholas Wiseman, D.D., Principal of the English College. 2 vols. 8vo. London: J. Booker.

Ward's Miscellany, under the superintendence of a Society for the Advancement of Literature, Science, and Religion. Imperial 8vo. Vol. I. London: Ward and Co.

An Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ. By Richard Treffry, Jun. 12mo. London: J. Mason.

General Introduction to a Course of Lectures on English Grammar and Composition. By Henry Rogers, Professor of the English Language and Literature, University College, London. 18mo. London: W. Ball.

Sermons, addressed chiefly to Young Persons, with a Sermon and Appendix on the Benefit of Scriptural Instruction. By M. M. Preston, Vicar of Cheshunt, &c. 12mo. London: W. Crofts.

The Christian Warfare illustrated. By Robert Vaughan, D.D. 12mo. London: Tract Society.

The Principle of National Ecclesiastical Establishments examined by the Scriptures. By J. Cole. 8vo. London: Effingham Wilson.

An Explication of the Hundred and Tenth Psalm; wherein the several heads of Christian Religion therein contained are largely explained and applied. By Edward Reynolds, D.D., afterwards Bishop of Norwich. 12mo. London: Tract Society.

A Sermon, preached in Lutterworth Church, on Wednesday, Dec. 20, 1837, upon occasion of the erection of a monument to the memory of Wielif. By the Rev. J. R. Gurney, M.A. Curate of Lutterworth. 8vo. Hamilton and Co.

National Education, the Question of Questions; being an apology for the Bible in Schools for the Nation; with remarks on centralization and voluntary Societies, and brief notes on Lord Brougham's Bill. By Henry Dunn, Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society. 8vo. London: Ward and Co.

A Course of Thirteen Lectures to Mechanics and others, delivered at Holywell Mount Chapel, in 1837, by Ministers in connection with the Christian Instruction Society. Carefully corrected and revised by the respective Lecturers. 12mo. London: W. Harding.

First Lessons in Singing and the Notation of Music: as adapted for Children: The Singing Master, No. 1. designed for the use of Schools. Second Edition. revised and corrected. 8vo. London: Taylor and Walton.

Select Meditations for every Day in the Year: being consecutive portions from Sermons by Edward Reynolds, D.D. Bishop of Norwich. Arranged and edited by the Rev. Cornwell Smalley, M.A. 12mo. London: J. Burns.

The Secret Disciple encouraged to avow his Master. By the Rev. J. Watson, late of Union Chapel, Islington. 18mo. London: Ward and Co.

The Preacher's Manual: Lectures on Preaching; furnishing rules and examples for every kind of pulpit address. By S. T. Sturtevant. Third Edition, revised and greatly enlarged. Large 8vo. London: Ward and Co.

Scripture Lessons, or the History of our Lord, in question and answer. Designed for the use of Bible Classes. By Mrs. Henderson. 2 vols. 18mo. London: Hamilton and Co.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WORKS IN THE PRESS, OR IN PROGRESS.

New Missionary Work on China.—CHINA; its State and Prospects, with especial reference to the Diffusion of the Gospel. By W. H. Medhurst, twenty years a Missionary to the Chinese. In one volume octavo.

Under the patronage of the London Missionary Society. A History of Madagascar, in connexion with the Protestant Mission; from its commencement in 1818 to the present Time. With an Account of the Country, the Religion, Manners, and Customs of the Inhabitants, principally in the interior. By the Missionaries on the Island. Edited by the Rev. William Ellis, Author of "Polynesian Researches." In two vols. 8vo. with maps and plates. Price not to exceed 30s.

Memorials of a Beloved Friend; or, a Brief Sketch of the Life of Mary Napier Lincolne. By Elizabeth Ritchie. With an Introductory Essay by Mrs. Henderson.

British Ecclesiastical History, from the Introduction of the Gospel into Britain, to our Times, including the Rise, Progress, and present State of every Denomination of Christians. In one thick volume, 12mo. By T. Timpson, Author of the "Companion to the Bible," "Church History through all Ages," &c.

We understand that the Author of the History of the Waldenses, (Mr. W. Jones,) has in the press, the third and concluding volume of "his Lectures of Ecclesiastical History," bringing down the subject to the present time. He proposes issuing it in monthly parts.

The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews; an Inquiry, in which the received title of the Greek Epistle is vindicated against the cavils of objectors, ancient and modern, from Origen to Michaelis, chiefly upon grounds hitherto unnoticed. By the Rev. Charles Forster, Author of the Life of Bishop Jebb.

Thoughts on the past and present State of Religious Parties in England, including the Substance of a Discourse delivered at Union Street Chapel, Southwark, Jan. 2, 1838. By Professor Vaughan, D.D.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES, AT HOME AND ABROAD.

ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN, FROM THE CONGREGATIONAL DISSENTERS OF THE NORTH RIDING OF YORKSHIRE.

At the Autumnal Meeting of the North Riding Association, held at Kirby Moorside, the following address to her Majesty, congratulating her on her accession to the throne, and stating their wishes for ecclesiastical approximation, was read and voted unanimously.

"To the Queen's most Excellent Majesty."

"Most Gracious Sovereign,—We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Ministers and Delegates representing the Protestant Dissenters of the Congregational Order, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, assembled at our half-yearly meeting, beg leave humbly to express the delight with which, when painfully bereaved of our late beloved Monarch, we hailed your Majesty's accession to the throne.

"Remembering with the highest respect the piety and virtues of your Majesty's illustrious father, who endeared himself to the people by his cordial and enlightened patronage of Bible Societies, and other useful institutions;—cherishing similar sentiments toward your happily surviving parent;—and rejoicing in your Majesty's most promising disposition and character, we find our traditional and steady attachment to the constitutional throne, heightened by warm feelings of personal interest and ardent hope, joined with dutiful and loyal reverence.

"We account it one of the brightest honours of your crown, that your Majesty reigns over nations enjoying the inestimable blessing of freedom, civil and religious. It is indelibly engraved on our memories, that the accession of the illustrious House of Hanover to the British Throne, delivered our predecessors in nonconformity from the operation of an iniquitous statute, by which they were to have been deprived, from the first of August, 1714, of the right of educating their youth. For that legal and zealous protection of the Protestant Dissenters which your Majesty's royal predecessors have from that time uniformly exercised, and which has animated our unshaken loyalty, we feel devoutly thankful; and are especially so for the enlargement of our religious liberties under his late Majesty, whose patriotic character and highly beneficent reign, will ever endear us to his memory. And we rely on your Majesty's gracious declaration, that it will be your 'unceasing study to secure to all the full enjoyment of religious liberty;' for which assurance we entreat your Majesty to accept our most humble and grateful acknowledgments.

"Without adverting to other measures for the extension of that great blessing, we crave permission to express our earnest desire for one, requisite especially for the progress of Christian charity;—a measure warmly desired both by those who first enjoyed the legal toleration under your Majesty's noble-minded predecessors William and Mary, and now by numbers *within*, as well as out of the establishment. That object is, that Episcopalian Clergymen may be permitted by law to preach, or otherwise officiate occasionally, in the Chapels of Protestant Dissenters, and Dissenting Ministers occasionally in the Churches of the Establishment, in every case at the voluntary invitation of the stated minister of the congregation, and according to its customary forms.

"It is our humble opinion, that of the whole number of your Majesty's Protestant subjects attending public worship, each Lord's-day in England and Wales, those who do so in congregations not connected with the Establishment, are the majority. Among the evangelical sects of which that majority is almost entirely composed, a cordial and brotherly feeling generally prevails, which has been cherished principally by such occasional interchanges of public ministerial services. The legal impossibility of any such interchanges between conforming

and nonconforming ministers, has contributed greatly to the existing alienation and asperity; which we deplore as contrary both to the will of our God and Saviour that his people shall be one, and to that cordial union of your Majesty's faithful subjects, which will promote the honour of your Crown, and the vigour of your Government.

"Though it may be long before the necessary alteration of the law can be made, yet considering the importance of the views with which the discharge of any office is begun, especially of one so high, and the great influence of a Sovereign on the sentiments of others, we have thought it not premature humbly to state our wishes, while presenting our dutiful congratulations on the auspicious commencement of your Majesty's reign. Most happy and thankful shall we be, if the breach among Protestants in England, made under your Majesty's renowned predecessor, Queen Elizabeth, the glory of whose reign was tarnished by intolerance, shall in this happier age be so far repaired, that your Majesty's government shall be celebrated as the triumph equally of political wisdom, and of christian charity.

"That your reign may be long, peaceful, happy, and glorious; that your Majesty may be strengthened for the weighty cares of empire by the refreshments of genuine piety and devotion; and may, after a protracted life of usefulness and honour, be raised to a throne in the presence of our Redeemer, is the earnest desire of our hearts, and shall be our constant prayer.

"Signed, on behalf of the Association, by us,

"GABRIEL CROFT, Minister at Pickering, } Secretaries of the
"WILLIAM BLACKBURN, Minister at Whitby, } Association."

In a polite letter from Lord John Russell, dated Whitehall, Nov. 10, the above Address is stated to have been "very graciously received by her Majesty."

JUBILEE CELEBRATION BY THE MOST ANCIENT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

The Congregational church now assembling in Union Street Chapel, Southwark, is considered the oldest Society of our denomination, having previously assembled in Deadman's Place, now called Park Street, since its foundation, 1611. Their present place of worship having been opened, January 2d, 1788, it was thought desirable that some devotional services and festive celebration should mark the close of the first half century during which they have occupied their present chapel.

Tuesday, January 2d, 1838, was therefore appointed. In the morning a public service was held in the chapel, when the Rev. Thomas Binney and the Rev. Edward Steane conducted the devotional services, and the Rev. Professor Vaughan, D.D. delivered an able discourse "On the Principles, History, and present position of English Congregationalism." It has been characterized by those who heard it, as "a masterly, faithful, philosophical, and dispassionate review" of that important subject. We are happy to hear that it will be soon given to the public from the press.

At four o'clock, about a hundred gentlemen assembled for dinner at the Bridge House Hotel. HENRY WAYMOUTH, Esq. in the chair. In the course of the evening the company were addressed by the Chairman, Mr. John Wilks, the Rev. J. Arundel, the Pastor, Mr. B. Hanbury, one of the Deacons, Dr. Vaughan, Mr. Josiah Conder, C. Hindley, Esq. M.P., Mr. Henry Dunn, the Rev. Algernon Wells, the Rev. John Burnett, and Mr. W. H. Black, in speeches of great intelligence and feeling.

We regret that the crowded state of our pages forbids the selection even of the most interesting passages in these eloquent addresses. A full report, however, of the proceedings appeared in *The Patriot* of Thursday, January 4th, to which we must refer our readers.

RE-OPENING OF HOWDEN CHAPEL, YORKSHIRE.

On Sunday, December 17th, 1837, the Independent Chapel, Howden, Yorkshire, after being considerably enlarged and improved, was re-opened for Divine service. The Rev. James Sibree, of Hull, delivered two excellent sermons on the occasion. During the week the congregation was also favoured with the able services of the Rev. John Ely, of Leeds, and the Rev. James Parsons, of York. The collections, together with previous efforts, amounted to the sum of £260.

A VILLAGE CHAPEL.

On Tuesday, January 2nd, 1838, the first stone of a new Independent Chapel was laid in the village of Ousefleet, in Marshland, Yorkshire, by Jarvis Empson, Esq., Jun., who, in conjunction with his respected father, J. Empson, Esq., of Goole Hall, have given the ground, accompanied with a handsome donation to assist in the erection. The day being fine, a considerable number of the villagers attended, and manifested by their appearance much pleasure in the services connected with the occasion. The Rev. T. Stratten, of Hull, delivered a very appropriate address; the Rev. J. Bruce, of Howden, and the Rev. H. Earl, of Goole, engaged in the devotional services.

This new station has been adopted by the Home Missionary Society; the Rev. Messrs. Stratten and Bruce, with a third party, engaging to raise £50 per annum towards the maintenance of a Home Missionary.

ORDINATIONS.

On Monday evening, Nov. 27th, Mr. Charles Green Stevens, (lately a student at Homerton College,) appointed to labour in the South-Sea Mission, was ordained at Bridge Street Chapel, in Bristol.

After the reading of the Scriptures and prayer by the Rev. Mr. Hunt, the Rev. Thomas Haynes proposed the questions, to which Mr. Stevens gave satisfactory replies. The ordination prayer was offered by the Rev. H. I. Roper, the pastor of the church; and the charge, founded on Isaiah xl. 3, was delivered by Mr. Stevens's Theological Tutor, the Rev. Dr. Pye Smith; after which, the Rev. John Williams, who is shortly returning to the South-Sea Islands, gave an interesting statement respecting the Polynesian Mission. The truly animating and affecting engagements of the evening were concluded with prayer by the Rev. Mr. Lucy.

The Rev. John Fernie, Jun., late a student at the Theological Academy, Hackney, having accepted a unanimous call from the church of the Independent denomination, Bushey, Herts, to become their pastor, was solemnly set apart to the work of the ministry in that chapel, on Thursday, December 10th, 1837.

There was a prayer-meeting at an early hour in the morning to implore the Divine blessing on the services of the day. After which, the ordination service was introduced by reading the scriptures and prayer, by the Rev. Mr. Hull, Baptist minister, Watford.

The Rev. A. Stewart, of Barnet, gave a very lucid statement of the nature of a gospel church, and after the recognition of the call by one of the deacons, the usual questions were proposed by the Rev. S. Ransom, Classical Tutor, Hackney. The Rev. John Fernie, Brewood, Staffordshire, the young minister's father, offered up a fervent prayer on behalf of his son.

A deeply interesting charge was delivered by the Rev. G. Collison, theological tutor, Hackney, from 1 Timothy i. 18., the interest of which was increased by the circumstance of his having taken the same part in the ordination of the young minister's father more than thirty years ago.

A soul-stirring sermon was preached to the people in the evening by the Rev. J. Morrison, D. D., from 3 John 8. "Fellow-helpers to the truth."

The Rev. Messrs. Hall and Temple, and Messrs. Bullin and William Fernie, students, took parts in the services.

The congregations were large, and a feeling of deep interest pervaded the engagements of the day.

REMOVAL.

The Rev. John Pyer, of South Molton, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the Independent church at Cork, formerly under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Burnet, of Camberwell, and is expected to commence his ministerial duties early in the present month.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

CONTINUED PERSECUTION OF THE DISSENTERS IN HOLLAND.

We learn from the November number of *The Reformation*, that the Dissenters are still subjected to the infliction of pecuniary penalties. Even very recently fines have been imposed on the Rev. Mr. Van Raalte, pastor of Deventer, and on the elder of the church at Leyden. Soldiers are still quartered at Bunschoten and Loosdrecht, (in the province of Utrecht,) as well as at Almkerk and Emmichoven, (in South Brabant.)

Rotterdam, October 15.—The Rev. Mr. Van Velzen, having repaired to Madame Visser's house in order to preach and administer the rite of baptism, their song of praise was overheard by individuals passing in the street, and in a short time a mob was assembled in front of the house. The sermon was then ended; nevertheless, they broke the windows, and several members of the church experienced very severe treatment. The magistrate and the superintendent of the police having been informed, though too late, of what was taking place, clearly evinced their determination to do all in their power to prevent violence; information was lodged, however, against the meeting, as being contrary to law.

Utrecht, October 15.—The brethren being obliged to hold their meetings in private houses, on account of the strict watch kept by the soldiers that no more than twenty should meet in their place of public worship, were assembled on that day at the house of Mr. Van der Horst, whose wife is a member of the church. The day passed without any molestation; but at half-past eight in the evening, two loud knocks were heard at the door, and Madame Van der Horst went to enquire who was there, when she found that some one had already entered by the window; it was an agent of police, who immediately opened the door and admitted the Commissioner, Van Lænen, attended by policemen and soldiers, to take possession of the house. Although the service was nearly at an end, Mr. Van Lænen violently drove out every one present, even the son of the family, though he made no little resistance. This shows what degree of credit is to be attached to the declaration of Mr. *Van Appeltère*, (Referendary of the department of justice,) that, "in the Netherlands, no persecution exists on account of religion."

On the following Sabbath, our pastor, the Rev. Mr. Scholte, preached to the brethren in another private house, without any opposition, while the police were engaged elsewhere narrowly watching whether any such meeting was held.

While the synod was convened at Utrecht, on the 7th of October, several of the neighbouring churches were permitted to enjoy the preaching of the word and the administration of the ordinances. Even at Loosdrecht, the church escaped the vigilance of the soldiers stationed in their houses. The Rev. Mr. Van Raalte, with the whole church, met for worship at their meeting-house during the night, while the guards were asleep.—*Archives du Christianisme*, Dec. 9.

REPLY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE NETHERLANDS TO THEIR BRETHREN OF THE CANTON DE VAUD, ON THE PERSECUTIONS IN HOLLAND.

We have already published the memorials sent by the pastors of the Canton of Vaud to the King and Clergy of the Netherlands, concerning the persecutions

which distress that country.* The answer returned by the Secretary of the General Synod to the letter which had been sent with the signature of "Le doyen de la Classe de Lausanne et Vevay," is so curious that we must give it to our readers word for word.

"To Mr. Victor Mellet, Pasteur d'Aigle, doyen de la Classe de Lausanne.

"Much honoured Brother in Christ Jesus our Lord,

"The letter, dated Lausanne, August, 1837, conveyed in yours of the 4th of October last, has fully convinced the Synodal Commission of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands, of the deep interest taken by our brethren of the Canton of Vaud in the peace and prosperity of our churches. This act of brotherly kindness has given rise to more satisfaction than surprise. We have ascribed it to that eminently christian spirit, which leads all the recipients of the Gospel to consider themselves as members of the same body, of which Christ our Lord and Saviour is the Divine Head.

"So touching a demonstration of affection could not have come to us from a more respectable quarter than from our Swiss brethren, bound to them as we are by unity of faith, and by relations the antiquity and intimacy of which our annals sufficiently attest.

"Nothing would have been more agreeable to the Synodal Commission than to give a proof of the reciprocal sentiments which animate them; but so much the more deeply do they regret that they are unable, on the present occasion, to comply with the request which has been made to them.

"Allow me frankly to state the reason, the true, the only reason which prevents us from even making it the subject of deliberation. Our brethren at a distance do not appear to have been rightly informed of the true state of things. Had they obtained accurate and impartial information as to the circumstances which relate to the dissensions and separations which we agree in deploring, they would have acknowledged that there was no room to address to us their present memorial.

"This, my much honoured Brother, is what I have been instructed to communicate to you in a brotherly, though official manner. The members of the Commission do not the less value the principle and intentions which have actuated the conduct of our brethren in the Canton of Vaud.

"May the God of truth and charity of his grace bestow, on all those who are sincerely seeking after truth, that spirit of charity, without which all desires and all efforts for the maintenance or re-establishment of peace and concord, for the edification of the church and the strengthening of that faith which is indispensable to the salvation of our souls, will prove of none effect.

"Receive every assurance of the high esteem and brotherly affection with which I remain,

"Much honoured Brother,

"Your affectionate Servant and Brother in Christ Jesus,

(Signed) "J. J. DERMONT,

"Secretary to the General Synod of the Reformed

"Church in the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

"The Hague, November 15th, 1837."

The result of this letter, amid conventional phrases designed to gild the refusal, is, that the Synodal Commission has not thought it proper even to deliberate on a letter signed by a HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR pastors of a church to which they profess to be "bound by unity of faith and by ancient and intimate relations." *You are ill-informed, and you had better be quiet*; this is, in fact, what the Secretary has "been instructed to communicate in a brotherly,

* This interesting document was translated for our work, and appeared in the number for December last, page 823.

though official manner," to the HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR individuals who had signed the letter, but without the addition of a single word of more correct information; an addition which it would certainly have been worth while to make, were it only as a matter of business. The aspirations after charity, with which this characteristic document is concluded, will have more weight, when those in whose name they are expressed, shall have ceased to be approvers of persecution.—*Archives du Christianisme*, Dec. 23d.

APOLOGY FOR THE DISSENTERS IN HOLLAND, BY SOME OF THEIR
DISTINGUISHED COUNTRYMEN.

The celebrated poet, Dacosta, who is also known for his religious works, has just taken up the defence of the persecuted Dissenters in Holland. The *Journal of the Hague*, wishing to infer, from an article which that clever author inserted in the *Nederlandsche Stemmen*, that it was his opinion that, even in a spiritual sense, the Dissenters of that country did not exist as a church, Mr. Dacosta has sent a letter to that periodical, in which he states, that if his ideas were not perverted, they were at least misunderstood. We shall quote the following passages:—

"The *Stemmen* has long founded its defence of the religious liberty of our dissenting brethren on the ground of their reformed creed. Whether or not the government recognizes them as a *separate church, an organized community*, whether or not we ourselves consider them yet as a church constituted or established in the Netherlands, it remains true that they are, in either case, members of the great reformed communion, which embraces the different sections of that evangelical religion, under whatever denominations they may be scattered in different parts of the christian world. Viewed as a part of this body, they are, in my opinion, acknowledged to be of a religion existing even at the time of our fundamental law; and by the 191st Article, they ought to be secured from every measure that could obstruct their meetings. The inquiry, whether these separatists form spiritually (that is to say, on the authority of God's word, and by virtue of a divine dispensation) a distinct and separate reformed church, is here a secondary question, which we have not decided, and which we need not decide, in seeking to establish their *title* and their *claims*. Spiritually and externally our Dissenters are Christians, belonging in persuasion, in profession, and in faith, to the reformed religion. What they are or are not in respect of ecclesiastical organization, neither detracts from nor adds to that first quality which is alone sufficient to make us stretch forth to them the hand of fellowship, and defend heartily and faithfully that liberty of conscience and worship which the constitution secures to them.

"Our position, as it respects the separatists and the church to which we still adhere, may be summed up in a few words. We say to the former, you are our brethren in the faith! If you find occasion to form a particular church, we shall willingly acknowledge her as a sister church in this country, as is the case in England, Switzerland, and other places. You shall be a dissenting reformed community, co-existing with the reformed church, historically and nationally so called, to which we still adhere, by the confession of those truths which are not yet entirely lost among us. At the same time, without quitting the Established Church, we loudly protest against the defection and infidelity which exist in it. Above all, we protest against the acts of a synod, which, having placed itself in absolute neutrality between truth and error, and not going one step beyond the maintenance of its administrative acts, does not glorify the name of our great God, Saviour, and King, Christ Jesus!"

This letter shows us how the persecutions are regarded in Holland by pious men of the Reformed Church. The voice of the honorable Mr. Groën, of Prinstere, is no longer an isolated voice. Mr. Dacosta, whose talent and character are so justly esteemed, rises with the same deep conviction and the same energy, against acts which we are surprised to see defended by any.

The dissenters of Holland have just sent petitions to the States-general, praying

for protection against the oppressing authorities. It is doubtless to be regretted that no member of the legislation has assumed the right of first calling the attention of his colleagues to these acts of the administration that are so justly complained of. May the discussion, which will shortly ensue lead to the serious examination of a question, the solution of which is so important to the physical and moral interests of a great part of the Dutch nation.

Moreover, we cannot but be filled with astonishment at the pretensions of the King of Holland to bring back his dissenting subjects to the bosom of the Protestant Church as by law established. The *Gazette of Leipsick* informs us that this prince has undertaken a work far more extraordinary. "In the very imprudent treaty concluded between this prince and the Holy See, the latter stipulated that the king should seek to bring about, between the Jansenist Church and the court of Rome, a union on the same footing as that between the Greeks and Armenians. King William, who never violates his promise, wished to act accordingly; but the Jansenist bishops having declared that the purity of their religious morals was inconsistent with such an arrangement, and that long experience had proved how pacific were the dispositions of the Jansenist Church, the king gave up all attempts at union; since this period, the Romish court has fomented the deplorable opposition of the Catholic clergy in Belgium, who in a measure produced the revolution of 1830, because the Court of Rome pretended that the king had not faithfully executed the treaty."

If such a treaty exists, we know not whether we should be most surprised to find the Holy See not scrupling to employ a heretical monarch to increase the number of adherents to the Romish Church, or to see a heretical monarch consenting to be the instrument of the Holy See in such a cause. His zeal in the reduction of those who dissent from a church, of which he pretends to be himself a bishop, is only a peccadillo by the side of such an enormity!—*Le Semeur*, Dec. 20.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL BODY OF DISSENTING MINISTERS IN LONDON ON THE PERSECUTIONS IN HOLLAND.

At a Special Meeting of the General Body of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, held at the Congregational Library, Blomfield-Street, Finsbury, on the 18th of January, 1838, to consider the Persecutions inflicted upon certain Christian Brethren, in Holland, and in other parts of the Continent of Europe, for conscience sake—

The Rev. J. BERRY, in the Chair:

It was resolved—

1. That the members of this body entertain the deepest conviction, that the forming of religious sentiments by free inquiry, the making of an open profession of them, and teaching and disseminating of them by argument and exhortation, by speaking, writing, and the ordinances of religious worship, or by any other peaceable and rational methods, is a right of mankind inherent and imprescriptible, conferred by the Creator, essential to moral accountableness, and which can never be infringed without injury and insult to the sufferers, and deep criminality on the part of those who are guilty of the infraction.

2. That it is proved, by the evident reason of the case, and the universal experience of mankind, that there is no greater obstacle to the improvement of the human race in knowledge and happiness, to the solid interests of national economy, to the elucidation of religious truth, to the satisfactory termination of religious controversies, and to the eventual and universal triumph of the genuine Gospel of Christ, than persecution for the sake of conscience and religious profession.

3. That whether such persecution wear its more barbarous form of direct punishment for religious opinions, or be exercised in the way of refusing protection, denying justice, or any deprivation whatever of civil rights, it is in principle the same—a high crime against God, and deserving the reprobation of all good men, according to the memorable declaration of the Emperor Maximilian II.—

"That he would never arrogate dominion over men's consciences, which is the prerogative of God alone: that in his judgment, no sin is more heinous than for any man to wish to exercise such dominion; and that those Potentates who have attempted it, as they invade the Sovereignty of Heaven, so they not unfrequently lose their own power on earth, and their names go down to posterity with infamy and reproach."

4. That the members of this Body cannot, therefore, refrain from expressing their deep concern, that the Government of Holland, a country once so greatly distinguished as the asylum of our persecuted fathers, has exposed a large number of its own subjects to the operation of a penal law, directly at variance with the principles of religious freedom; that they affectionately present their fraternal sympathy to their persecuted Christian brethren, assuring them of the lively sense they entertain of the wrongs they suffer, and of the indignity thus put upon our common Christianity; and that they earnestly desire and pray that the day may speedily arrive, when neither in Holland, nor elsewhere on the Continent of Europe, the sacred rights of conscience shall be invaded, by the assumption on the part of the civil power, of that jurisdiction, which belongs only to God.

(Signed)

JOSEPH BERRY, Chairman.

By order of the Meeting,

GEORGE CLAYTON, Secretary to the Body.

PROGRESS OF EVANGELICAL OPINIONS IN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

We are happy to receive the first number of a new periodical, called *The Inquirer*, originating with that portion of the Society of Friends who hold the doctrine of justification by faith. We wish it success, and are happy to select the following article of intelligence from its pages, which we are sure will gratify many of our readers.

"The Society of Friends.

"Since the time of the yearly meeting in London, there has been little passing in the Society of a very public character. They then, as a body, sanctioned the proceedings of the Committee in Lancashire; and, in other respects, opposed the introduction of moral evangelical views, and thus forbade that hope of a scriptural reformation, which, till that time, some had fondly entertained. The course of these, therefore, became quite clear; and, in different parts of the country, the resignations of membership have been numerous. These, added to the number who had previously left the Society at Manchester, have swelled the list to a considerable extent. Some of them, perhaps to the number of fifty, attracted by the sound evangelical ministry they have found in the Church of England, in their particular neighbourhoods, especially in London, at the chapel of B. W. Noel, and in Liverpool, at that of H. McNeil, have joined the Establishment; a few have attached themselves to the Methodist Society, and two have become ministers among them; while others have associated in religious worship, or have joined Independent or Baptist churches. The larger part who have left, however, remain unconnected with any of the existing bodies of Christians, although united in gospel bonds with all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity.

"It is interesting to observe, that in respect to the ordinances, the calm and unprejudiced examination of the word of divine truth has led to similar results; so that, though residing in various parts of the country, unconnected with each other, and without any mutual communication, many have believed it to be their christian duty, in obedience to their Lord's command, to observe the rite of baptism, and to break bread in remembrance of him.

"It is a cheering sign of the times, to witness the breaking down of some of those hindrances to christian communion among believers which have hitherto existed, the reaching forth of the right hand of fellowship between those who do not, in all points, see eye to eye. Thus, in regard to baptism, some have been admitted to the rite, with all the feelings of christian brotherhood, without its involving an act of membership; and where baptism by immersion has been

heretofore strictly required before communion, it has, in several instances, been dispensed with. The barriers to christian fellowship among believers thus appear gradually to give way; and we cannot but view it as the presage of better things at hand—ns a dawn of a brighter day on the Church of Christ.

"We have reason to believe that the number is increasing in the Society, of those who are convinced of the scriptural authority of the ordinances, and who deplore the loss sustained by the rejection of them.

"We are pleased to learn, that the seceding Friends at Manchester are enjoying great harmony and spiritual refreshment, and that several of them have partaken together of the commemorative Supper, meeting each month for that purpose. They have several ministers among themselves; and have also been addressed, on different occasions, by well-known and highly respected members of other religious denominations.

"We understand that, in other places, our friends have met to break bread together. We rejoice in this testimony to the continued obligation of the command of our Lord, divested of the corruptions and additions of man; not doubting that the Lord will, of a truth, make himself known to them in thus taking the bread and wine; and bless, to their spiritual refreshment, the observance of his ordinance.

"At Manchester, a new chapel is completed, in Grosvenor-street, Charlton, which was opened for Divine worship on Sunday, the 17th inst. It is a neat and commodious building, with galleries on three sides, and a spacious school-room underneath, and is calculated to accommodate about 700 persons. The service in the morning commenced at half-past ten, and in the afternoon at three o'clock.

"After a silence of about half an hour, prayer was then offered up by Isaac Crewdson, who subsequently read the 55th chapter of Isaiah and the 2nd chapter of Ephesians; and afterwards addressed the meeting on the freeness and fulness of the invitations of the Gospel, from Rev. xxii. 17; 'And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him who is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.' The meeting was concluded by an appropriate prayer by William Boulton.

"In the afternoon, the 51st Psalm and the 6th chapter of Luke were read by Isaac Crewdson; and an impressive sermon was preached by William Boulton, from 2 Cor. iv. 5. 'For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.' The meeting was opened and concluded with prayer by Mr. Crewdson. The attendance both morning and afternoon, was considerable.

"In the title deed it is provided, that the purposes to which the chapel is applied shall be consistent with the following views:—

"That the Scriptures are given by Divine inspiration, and are the revelation of the will of God to man, in all things necessary to his eternal happiness; that they are the rule of faith and practice; and that nothing which is not found therein is to be regarded as an article of faith, or as requisite to salvation.

"That God is revealed through the Holy Scriptures in the character of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

"That in the holy Scriptures we are taught that man fell by sin from the state of holiness in which he was created; that his posterity are born in the same fallen condition; and thus being by nature prone to evil, and at enmity against God, all the world is guilty before him.

"That all mankind are to be invited to accept the salvation which is freely offered in the Gospel of Christ.

"That the Son of God, by whom the worlds were created, and by whom all things consist, was made flesh, and died upon the cross, a propitiation for the sins of the whole world; that through his perfect righteousness and atoning sacrifice all who repent and believe in him are delivered from condemnation;

and, being justified by faith, are made heirs of eternal life, and receive the gift of the Holy Ghost as the earnest of their inheritance; that being thus made alive unto God by a new creation in Christ Jesus unto good works, the believer delights in the holy law of God, takes the precepts of the Gospel as his rule of duty, and seeks to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

LADY HEWLEY'S CHARITIES.—IN CHANCERY.

In answer to the inquiries that are frequently made respecting the state of this important and long pending suit, some would think it a sufficiently intelligible reply to say, "Why, the Charities are in Chancery!" Such an answer, however, would convey an insinuation against that Court, which, in this instance, is not deserved. For Lord Lyndhurst, after he had left office, by the consent of both parties, gave judgment, on February 5th, 1836, by which he confirmed the decree of his Honour the Vice Chancellor, made December 17th, 1833, and which determined, "*that no persons who deny the divinity of our Saviour's person, and who deny the doctrine of original sin, as it is generally understood, are entitled to participate in Lady Hewley's Charity, or to continue as Trustees,*" and the Unitarian Trustees were removed accordingly.* In consequence of this decision of Lord Lyndhurst, those gentlemen have appealed to the House of Lords against his Lordship's judgment. At a subsequent date, Lord Cottenham, the present High Chancellor, ordered that the Judges shall attend the final hearing and adjudication of this important case. But, from the state of public business, we believe there is no reason to expect that the House of Lords can hear the appeal till late in the present sessions of Parliament. As soon, however, as the judgment of Lord Lyndhurst made the exclusion of the Unitarian Trustees almost certain, two classes of persons, claiming to be orthodox Presbyterians, in the north of England, separately petitioned the Lord Chancellor for leave to go before the Master, Lord Henley, to watch the proceedings, and to nominate the trustees and managers, as all the persons proposed by the relators were Independents, and which the Lord Chancellor ordered accordingly.

The two petitions proceeded from the Rev. John Park and others, on behalf of 51 congregations in the six northern counties, usually understood to belong to the Church of Scotland, and from the Rev. Dr. Thomson, on behalf of 50 congregations belonging to the United Secession Church, forming the Association of the United Presbyteries of Lancashire, Newcastle, and Carlisle. These two parties, on going before the Master, were mutually afraid of each other, and in their proposals and *affidavits* they made broad statements against the claims of their Presbyterian brethren. It is curious to observe some of the assertions unequivocally made on each side. Dr. Thomson, in his "Proposal," states that for several reasons he therein sets forth, none of the 51 congregations in the northern counties connected with the Church of Scotland, are strictly English Presbyterians, or English Protestant Dissenters, and consequently are not Presbyterians intended to be benefited by the charities of Lady Hewley. And in this affidavit of Dr. Thomson and his associates, as against the Presbyterians of the Scottish Church, they swear, "that it is a new thing for said John Park and others to assume the character of Dissenters. Hitherto they have made it their boast that they are not English Dissenters, but members of the National Scotch Church. Now that Lady Hewley's property seems to be within their reach, they humble themselves to the style of Dissenters from the Church of England! Their habits and feelings are altogether foreign to those of English Protestant Dissenters. The ministers of their connection in London form no part of the Board of Three Denominations of

* Both judgments, with the particulars, may be found in our Magazine for April, 1836. pp. 205—225.

English Dissenters; nor have any of their ministers been known to co-operate with Dissenters in any of those measures which have been adopted to obtain redress of the general grievances of Dissenters." The Scotch Kirk men are further charged "with hazarding assertions (*upon oath*) utterly destitute of evidence," assertions "reckless," "unfounded," and "most false." They are charged with a "wretched quibble," and the spirit of the whole is summed up in one sentence, "that deponents will make no further remarks on this strange and inconsistent conduct, than to *express their sorrow that it precludes that amicable intercourse which they wished to cultivate with the said Rev. John Park,*" the representative of the congregations of the Church of Scotland.

On the other hand, the Rev. J. Park and others, of the Scottish Church, have been equally decided against the claims of their brethren of the United Secession Church. Mr. Park sets forth "that the Secession Church had no existence until the year 1734," being about twenty-four years after the death of Lady Hewley, and "being amenable to and under the ecclesiastical controul of the United Associate Synod in Scotland, they cannot be regarded in any sense as English Presbyterians, not one of whose old congregations are to be found in such Seceder's communion." That "they have no title in equity to the administration of Lady Hewley's charity, or to the appointment of trustees for that purpose."

The Master, Lord Henley, having heard the arguments, expressed his determination to appoint *two* of each class of trustees from the Scotch Church; *two* of each from the Secession Church, and *three* of each from amongst the Independents. This decision appearing to the relators as most extraordinary, they resolved to move the Vice-Chancellor to order the Master to revise his report. Immediately upon this, the Scotch gentlemen, who had so plainly expressed their convictions respecting the untenable claims of their opponents, and were so shocked, "that their proceedings would preclude that amicable intercourse they wished to cultivate," suddenly became friends, made common cause, and in one common petition prayed that the report of the Master might be confirmed, and their united claim established, although each had sworn that the other had no claim in equity! They have even proceeded a step further, by moving the Lord Chancellor to hear the petition, instead of allowing his Honour the Vice-Chancellor to decide upon it. This motion, however, his Lordship refused on January the 27th, and refused it with costs. The question, therefore, we presume, will be speedily adjudicated by the Vice-Chancellor, but what the decision will be it is impossible to anticipate.

To us it appears, that on doctrinal grounds the *three* parties have claims in common, as they all teach those opinions which Lady Hewley most assuredly believed. Superficial persons have also imagined, from their common name, that as Presbyterians the Scotch claimants have a greater right to administer these charities than the Congregational relators. But when it is known that the English Presbyterians observed none of those peculiarities of discipline from which their name arose, but actually symbolized with the Congregational brethren, as they solemnly witnessed in the Heads of Agreement, 1691—that they were *English* as to country, and nonconformists as to an establishment, we really are surprised at the order of Lord Henley. Should the Vice-Chancellor confirm that order, and place ministers of the Church of Scotland and of the Secession Church, volunteers and endowment-men, at the same Board, after the solemn oaths of the one party that the others have no claim in *equity* to be there, it will require, we guess, all the soothing influence of property and place to enable parties so hostile to maintain "amicable intercourse."

THE CHURCH QUESTION IN SCOTLAND.

As the leaders of the church of Scotland persevere in their applications to her Majesty's Government and the Parliament for endowments for their new churches, &c., and as the subject is expected to be discussed in the House of Commons at an early period, the dissenters of Scotland, with their characteristic

ardour and decision, have, during the past month, held important meetings in Edinburgh, to express their opposition to all such proposed grants.

On Wednesday, January 3d, the United Associate Synod held an extraordinary, and, throughout the history of their connection, an entirely unprecedented meeting, at Dr. John Brown's church, Broughton Place, Edinburgh. Although the season was unusually rigorous, yet there were not less than 140 ministers and delegates present from all parts of Scotland, to record their opinions on this important question. We regret that we have not room to insert the argumentative and able resolutions of the Synod, in the close of which, they authorized a deputation to visit the metropolis and chief towns in England, "to solicit the powerful aid of the more active and influential amongst the English dissenters—to prevent the adoption of a measure which, while it can promote the true advantage of none, would unquestionably endanger the stability of the present Administration, and the safety, the peace, and prosperity of the whole united kingdom."

On Thursday, January 4, "The Scotch Central Board of Dissenters" held a public meeting in Bristo Street Church, when ARCHIBALD THOMPSON, Esquire, presided, and between two and three thousand persons were present. The meeting was addressed by the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, Glasgow; the Rev. William M'Dougall, Kilmarnock; Rev. A. Marshall, Kirkintilloch; Rev. A. M'Michael, Dumfermline; Rev. Dr. Heugh, Glasgow; Rev. J. Harper, Leith; Rev. H. Renton, Kelso; Rev. Mr. Angus, Aberdeen; Rev. W. L. Alexander, Edinburgh; and by James Piddie, jun., Esq., W.S.; James Beith, Esq., Glasgow; D. Dewar, Esq., Dumfermline; Councillor Falkner; Bailie Muir, Greenock; Messrs. Newlands, D. M'Laren, and other gentlemen. The powerful speeches delivered on this occasion were fully reported in "*The Scottish Pilot*," Jan. 6, together with the resolutions of the meeting. We can only find room to insert one of the resolutions, which, whether intended or not, embodies a noble sentiment which Lord John Russell expressed in Parliament on the church-rate question, and which we trust his Lordship's colleagues will bear in mind on the present question.

"That the reports of the commission of inquiry which have been published, disprove the exaggerated statements regarding the destitution of the means of 'religious instruction, and pastoral superintendence,' alleged to exist in those places to which these reports refer. And while this meeting admit, and deeply regret, that there exists in many parts of our country much irreligion and vice, they conceive that the proper means for the removal of these evils is not the multiplication of churches and state-paid clergy, but the support and encouragement, by voluntary contributions, of missionaries and Christian Instruction Societies. That these means have been already eminently successful, and their increased activity and usefulness may be expected from the growing interest felt by all denominations in the spread of the gospel; while, by interfering on such a subject in favour of *one* religious denomination, the legislature is stepping out of its proper province, and will do much to paralyze the efforts of Christians of *all* denominations in a department of duty which blesses him who gives equally with him who receives."

Amongst the many able addresses which were delivered, it is difficult to make a selection, but we choose the following passages from the conclusive speech of Dr. Heugh, because they will best explain to our readers the reasons of these proceedings.

"He hoped it would be understood that between the friends of the Establishment and the Dissenters there was no difference upon this, that accommodation should be furnished for all who could be induced to occupy it, provided that proper means,—for, no doubt, Christianity never sanctioned improper means to gain an end, however good and holy in itself,—provided that right and proper means were taken to obtain it. If any one imagined that there was anything in the conduct of Dissenters on this subject inconsistent with their common belief, he appealed to the fact that Dissenters had raised 700 hundred places of

worship in this portion of the northern island alone. If they went to the great masses of the population, such as Edinburgh and Glasgow, it would be shown that Dissenters, at their own cost, and unaided by any body, had provided more means of religious instruction to the people, within less than one century, than the Church, with all its wealth and State support, had done in three centuries. The Rev. Gentleman then proceeded to explain that Dissenters objected to the movement of the Church in favour of additional accommodation, solely because the funds asked were public funds, to which Dissenters and Churchmen alike contributed. He showed also, that the exaggerated statements, respecting the destitution of the country, arose from excluding the means provided by Dissenters from their calculations. Another circumstance overlooked was, whether the existing accommodation was all occupied. One would naturally think, that so long as the accommodation was unoccupied, there was no need of additional accommodation; but not so, thought the Churchmen, they took calculations for fact, and submitted what should be, for what really was. He knew no delusion equal to this, but it had been so often and pertinaciously repeated, that the parties had proceeded in deceiving themselves and the Legislature into the belief of its truth. The meeting had all heard of the celebrated Isaac Watts, who was one of the smallest men in England, but who, poor man, became hypochondriac in his old age, and fancied himself grown to an immense size. He could not find a chair large enough to hold him, and his medical attendant, yielding to the humour of his patient, procured a chair of extraordinary dimensions, into a corner of which old Isaac squeezed himself, saying, 'You see, Doctor, how much I need more accommodation!'"

It is reported that Drs. Wardlaw and Heugh, of Glasgow, and the Rev. James Harper, of Leith, are the deputation to visit this country on the subject, and we request, for them, the zealous co-operation of the English Dissenters, for this is not a Scottish, but a national question. The church of Scotland form the advanced guard of the allied army of the episcopal church of the United Kingdom. Let but the Scotch Presbyterians succeed, and the Lords Bishops will, of course, urge their claim to large grants of money, to be added to the million and a half already expended for church building. The Dissenters of England must, therefore, do their duty.

MARTYRDOM IN MADAGASCAR.

As we presume that all our readers are possessed of "The Missionary Magazine and Chronicle," so we do not transcribe into our pages the deeply interesting account which appears in that valuable penny periodical for the present month, of the christian heroism of one of the earliest of the native converts, RAFARAVAVY, a female in good circumstances, who, during a period of eight or ten days, was imprisoned and tortured, but who remained firmly attached to the truth, and would neither impeach her companions nor renounce her faith in Christ, but calmly submitted to death by public execution, on August 14th, 1837. We cannot refrain, however, from transcribing a passage in Mr. Baker's letter relating to this melancholy event.

"Never did a Christian martyr in the annals of the Church suffer from motives more pure, simple, and unmixed with earthly alloy. She had never heard of any after-glory of martyrdom on earth. No external splendour had been cast around the subject in her mind, by reading any lives of martyrs. All was to her obloquy and contempt. Her own father and relatives to the very last accused her of *stubbornness*. The people generally regarded her as *stubborn*, and worthy of punishment even on that account. She had no earthly friends to support and cheer her. She was not poor in outward circumstances, and by recantation and by humbling herself to beg pardon of the Queen, she might very probably have saved her life. But her whole heart, as her letters testify, was filled with the love of Jesus. She endured as seeing Him who is invisible. Her letters are composed principally of passages from the gospels and epistles, and these, doubtless, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, were the entire

support of her mind in the last hour of trial. If 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church,' we may trust that Rafaravavy will not have died in vain. She died directly and exclusively in defence of the Gospel."

We cannot but record our firm conviction that this event will be for the furtherance of the gospel. Tertullian, in his celebrated Apology, could address the persecutors of the first Christians in language which our faith may well adopt; Proceed in your career of cruelty; but do not suppose that you will thus accomplish your purpose of extinguishing the hated sect. We are like the grass, which grows the more luxuriantly, the oftener it is mown. The blood of the Christians is the seed of Christianity. Your philosophers taught men to despise pain and death, by words; but how few their converts, compared with those of the Christians, who teach by example! The very obstinacy with which you upbraid us, is the great propagator of our doctrines. For who can behold it, and not inquire into the nature of that faith which inspires such supernatural courage? Who can inquire into that faith, and not embrace it? Who can embrace it, and not desire himself to undergo the same sufferings, in order that he may thus secure a participation in the fulness of the divine favour?"

Nor can we believe that this occurrence will be less useful at home; the deep emotion and fervent spirit of prayer it has called forth, the godly emulation it has excited, provoking some to jealousy, that they have done and suffered so little for our Lord and Saviour, will produce a powerful reaction in favour of the cause of missions. Thus the wicked *one* will be taken in his own craftiness, the wrath of man shall praise God, and the rest of that wrath will he restrain.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS, &c.

Favours have been received from the Rev. Drs. J. P. Smith—Bennett—Rev. Messrs. J. Bruce—R. Ashton—R. Baird, (Paris)—J. C. Brown, (St. Petersburg)—J. Arundel—G. Gogerly.

Also from Messrs. Philip Smith—W. Fernie—T. Phipson—Jos. Christy—T. Coleman—Alpha—Mrs. Ellis—Miss Henderson.

The Editor regrets that the space devoted to the important controversy on Inspiration has compelled him to postpone several articles of Review; also a Letter from Dr. J. P. Smith, in Reply to Mr. Walford; Mr. Rice's paper on Solomon's Song, and some other critical articles. He is compelled to remind his learned Correspondents, that, highly valuable as are their papers on biblical criticism, &c. they do not excite general interest; and as the Editor has to cater for the tastes of many, variety is indispensable. Will those friends who propose to assist him with papers, read Mr. Toplady's editorial advice contained in the Letter, which is inserted at page 105 of the present number.